STUDIES IN NIBANDHA-S

BHABATOSH BHATTACHARYA
M.A., D.Litt., B.L., *Kāvyatīrtha*

Professor of Sanskrit, City College, Calcutta and Sir William Jones Research Fellow (1949-1952), Asiatic Society, Calcutta
Author of *Raghunandana's Indebtedness to his Predecessors* and *Studies in Dharmaśāstra* and Editor of the *Dānasāgara* of Ballāla Sena.

INDIAN STUDIES
PAST & PRESENT

Printed by R. K. Maitra from the *R. D. Press*, 11B, Chowringhee Terrace, Calcutta-20 and published by him on behalf of *Indian Studies : Past and Present*, 3 Sambhunath Pandit Street, Calcutta-20

Rs. 15·00

(40 Shillings or 5 Dollars)

Date of Publication
January 8, 1968

PREFACE

The present volume, originally intended to be published as *Studies in Dharmaśāstra*, vol, ii (Mediaeval Period), is now being presented to the public as *Studies in Nibandha*-s.' It is a sequel to *Studies in Dharmaśāstra* (vol. i Ancient Period), published in 1964 and as such the number of the Appendices (D to I) in the body of the present work is inadvertently in continuation of those of the previous work, but is A to F in the Appenadices themselves. Like the previous work it is also a collection of the present writer's originally published papers of the last three decades, except the portions relating to Govindānanda's fifth digest, the *Kriyākaumudī* and his place of residence and social pedigree and the major portion of the detailed description of his *Varṣakriyā kaumudī*, which are being published here for the first time. It covers the whole of Eastern and Northern India, including Bengal, Mithila and Uttarapradeśa and describes in detail some of the *nibandha-s*, composed in these areas between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries of the christian era. But its treatment of the work of Raghunandana, the great Bengali digest-writer of the 16th century, is rather short, describing as it does only the contents of his neglected small work, the *Maṭhapratiṣṭhāditattva*, embodied in section vi and concerning itself with 'consecration of temples in the 16th century'. This was published earlier in the *Bhāratīya Vidyā* vol. xiii, Bombay, 1952, only a year later than the subject-matter of section vii, dealing with "A few remarks on S.C. Banerji's 'Smṛtinibandha Literature and Bengal's contribution'." Though the originally published ABORI (Poona) paper, which contained the present section vii, listed the already published papers by the present writer on Raghunandana, yet the list was naturally wanting in the mention of the name of the later *Bhāratīya Vidyā* paper. Section vii, though augmented here with the mention of the present writer's monograph viz. *Raghunandana's indebtedness to his predecessors*, published in 1955 from the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, inadvertently repeats the previous omission of the rference to the *Bhāratīya Vidyā* paper, which reference is made here also by way of supplementing the information of this paper, as given in note 141 on p. 91 of the present work. The publication of the present writer's above-mentioned monograph on Raghunandana is the primary reason of his exclusion from the present volume of details of Raghunandana's other works. The present treatise, however, delineates *in extenso* the chronology and contents of the works of some of Raghunandana's more important predecessors, the works of whom were immensely laid by him under contribution for the production of his encyclopaedic *Smṛtitatta*, divided into 28 parts. As in the previous volume, so in the present one the author wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to his veteran friend and inspirer, MM. Dr. P.V. Kane, Bhārata-ratna, National Professor of Indology and to his friend and colleague, Prof. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, the editor of the *Indian Studies : Past & Present*. The chronology of

the respective authors, treated in this volume, except that of Vidyāpati and Govindānanda, is based upon Dr. Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. i and the co-operation and courtesy of Prof. Chattopadhyaya are responsible for the speedy publication of the present volume in such a fine form.

City College, Calcutta
8th January, 1968

BHABATOSH BHATTACHARYA

CONTENTS

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

p. 41 note 88 —Add the following :—

'But the only quotation on p. 823 of the Malamāsatattva, prefixed with the phrase, *Vidyāpati-kṛta*, is from Vidyāpati's Varṣakṛtya, no MS. of which has as yet been discovered. The two other quotations in the Malamāsatattva, the single quotation in the Durgotsavatattva and the single quotation in the Ekādaśītattva from the Varṣakṛtya are not from Vidyāpati's work but from Vācaspati Miśra's work of the same name (Asiatic Society, Calcutta, MS. No. G 8682, folios 12, 46, 38 and 53 respectively), as has been shown by Dr. Miss Vāṇī Chakravarti in her Bengali monograph viz. *Samāja-saṃskāraka Raghunandana* (p. 101)'.

p. 49 ll. 20-22 Substitute the following for "but is a different work...'Vidyāpati-Kṛta-Varṣakṛtye" :—

"But is the name of two different works by two different authors, Vidyāpati and Vācaspati Miśra, having been quoted thrice in the Malamāsatattva (pp. 775, 822 and 823), the first two with the word '*Varṣakṛtye*' being from Vācaspati's work of the same name (folios 12 and 46 of the A.S. MS., referred to above) and the last with the phrase *Vidyāpati-Kṛta-Varṣakṛtye* being unmistakably from an undiscovered work of Vidyāpati".

p. 49 l. 27—Add '(No. IB 57, folios, 7, 8 and 34)' between 'of the same work' and 'referred to'.

p. 49 l. 31—Add the following after 'of the same name' :—

'The present writer has also recently identified the above reference in the A.S. MS. of the same (folio 36)'.

p. 99 ll. 13-16—Substitute the following sentence for that between ll. 13-16 :—

'It means the works of the same name by Vidyāpati, the famous Maithila poet and dharmaśāstra writer[170] and by Vācaspati Miśra, his successor of the same region in dharmaśāstra-writing. As Raghunandana expressly says Vidyāpati-Kṛta-Varṣakṛtye in introducing one[171] of those quotations in his Malamāsatattva, so that quotation only is indisputably from Vidyāpati's work of the same name, while the remaining two quotations are from Vācaspati's work of the same name, as has been shown above (pp. 41 and 49).

I. Lakṣmīdhara Bhaṭṭa (1100-1150 A. D.)

The *Kṛtyakalpataru*

a) Its place in Dharmaśāstra Literature

Śūlapāṇi and Raghunandana are the two Bengali *nibandhakāra*-s, whose works are the guiding authorities in the social and religious life of a modern Bengali Hindu. These two authors have quoted many times in their treatises a work called *Kalpataru*. Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra, the eighteenth century commentator of Śūlapāṇi's *Śrāddhaviveka*, while interpreting the word *kalpataruḥ* occuring on the second page of the book, was at a loss to find out whether it meant a work or an author in which latter case he suggested the supply of the word *āha* (i.e. has said) to make the meaning clear.[1] Caṇḍeśvara, Vācaspati Miśra and Vardhamāna are the three prominent writers on Dharmaśāstra, who flourished in Mithilā (modern North Bihar) in the 14th and 15th centuries of the Christian era. Śūlapāṇi and Raghunandana, referred to above, flourished in the 15th and 16th centuries respectively. The *Kṛtyaratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara in its 24th and 25th introductory verses[2] explicitly says that the *Kṛtyaratnākara* (lit. the ocean of religious duties), free from defects, holding the *kalpavṛkṣa* (lit. 'the wish-fulfilling tree'), *kāmadhenu* (lit. 'the wish-fulfilling cow') and *pārijāta* (lit. 'the celestial tree') in appropriate places, teeming with quotations from Viṣṇu, Vyāsa and others, and filled with nectar, has been prepared by Caṇḍeśvara, who is conversant with the Smṛtis and Vedas ; and that the experienced master of Polity (meaning the author himself) has considered all the subjects, in which nothing has been said by the *Kāmadhenu*, nothing good has been conferred by the *Kalpataru* and no scent of which has been held by the *Pārijāta*. There is thus reference to the three earlier *nibandha*-s viz. the *Kalpataru*, *Kāmadhenu* and *Pārijāta*. The body of the work *Kṛtyaratnākara* contains 21 quotations from the *Kalpataru* and 3 from Lakṣmīdhara, who as we shall see later on, is the author of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*. The quotations from the *Kāmadhenu* and *Pārijāta* are two and ten in number respectively. The *Gṛhastharatnākara*, another work of Caṇḍeśvara, quotes the *Kalpataru* six times, the *kalpatarukāra* (i.e. the author of the *Kalpataru*) twice and Lakṣmī-

1. Tatra śrāddha-lakṣaṇa-prasaṅge Kalpataruḥ athaitadityādi brāhmaṇasyāhavanīya-tulyatetyantaḥ Kalpatarunāmagranthaḥ / Kalpatarupadasya granthakāraparatve āhavanīyatulyatetyanantaram āheti kriyādhyāhāreṇānvayaḥ / (*Śrāddhavīveka*, p. 3)
2. Vibhrāṇaḥ kalpavṛkṣam kvacana parisare kāmadhenuṃ dadhānaḥ
   Kvāpyantaḥ pārijātam kvacidapi ca dadhad-dośayādovimuktaḥ /
   Śrīmac-caṇḍeśvareṇa smṛti-nigama-vidā tanyate tena tadvad
   Viṣṇu-vyāsādi-vākya-sphurad-amṛtamayaḥ kṛtyaratna-karo'yam //
   Yasminna kiñcidapi śaṃsati kāmadhenur
   Yatreṣṭamalpamapi kalpatarunna datte /
   Dhatte na gandhamapi kañcana pārijātas
   Tat-sarvameṣa vivinakti nayapravīṇaḥ //

dhara eleven times. The *Vivādaratnākara*, a third work of Caṇḍeśvara, also quotes the *Kalpataru* eleven times, the *kalpatarukāra* once and Lakṣmīdhara six times. Vācaspati Miśra's *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* says in the second introductory verse[3] that the author Vācaspati has prepared his work on pilgrimages, after having carefully perused the *Kṛtyakalpadruma*, *Pārijāta*, *Ratnākara* and other works and bowed down to Madhusūdana (i.e. the god Viṣṇu). This author further says in his introductory verse[4] to *Gayāvidhi* on p. 268 of the above work that he is laying down the procedure of the holy place of the Fathers (i.e. Gayā), after having seen the *Vāyavya* (i.e. *Vāyupurāṇa*), *Gārutmata* (i.e. *Garuḍapurāṇa*) and *Kalpavṛkṣa* (i.e. *Kalpataru*), discussed in the light of Shastric reasoning and bowed down to Ādigadādhara (a form of Viṣṇu). This work quotes the *Kalpataru* four times and the *kalpatarukāra* twice. The third concluding verse[5] of the *Daṇḍaviveka*, the only published work of Vardhamāna, says that the author consulted the *Kalpataru*, *Kāmadhenn*, *Ratnākara*, *Pārijāta* and various other works. The quotations from the *Kalpataru* and Lakṣmīdhara in the *Daṇḍaviveka* are forty-one and two in number respectively. The four published digests of Govindānanda (vide above in Part I, p. 8), another 16th century Bengali *nibandhakāra*, also contain quotations from the *Kalpataru* and its author. The *Varṣakriyākaumudī* quotes the *Kalpataru* thrice, the *Dānakriyākaumudī* once, the *Śrāddhakriyākaumndī* eleven times and the *Śuddhikaumudī* only once. The *Kalpatarukāra* has also been quoted five times in the *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī*. The citations from the *Kalpataru* in the twenty-eight works of Raghunandana have already been indicated and identified by the present writer in his monograph viz., *Raghunandana's Indebtedness to his Predecessors* (pp. 232-36).

A MS. of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* (which name has been either abbreviated into *Kalpataru* by most writers or paraphrased into *Kalpavṛksa* or *Kṛtyakalpadruma* by some, as seen above) of Lakṣmīdhara, consisting of twelve *kāṇḍa*-s (or sections), has been noticed in the Udaipur Durbar Library (Peterson's First Report, 1883) and is the most complete MS. at present known. The work originally consisted of fourteen *kāṇḍa*-s, as can be gathered from the quotations in later authors, of which twelve are now forthcoming. Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane consulted some *kāṇḍa*-s of this Udaipur MS., which has 1108 folios and identified[6] it to be nothing but the *Kalpataru*, quoted by later *nibandhakāra*-s. The author, Lakṣmīdhara, was the minister for peace and war of king Govindacandra of Kanauj, who reigned from 1114 to 1156 A.D., and so the former must have flourished during that

3. Śrī-Kṛtyakalpadruma-pārijāta-ratnākarādīn avalokya yatnāt /
Praṇamya mūrdhnā madhusūdanāya vācaspatis tīrthavidhiṃ tanoti //
4. Vāyavya-gārutmata-kalpavṛkṣān dṛṣṭvā vicāryāpi ca śāstrayuktyā /
Tanoti natvā" digadādharāya vācaspatiḥ śrī-pitṛ-tīrtha-saṃsthām //
5. kalpataru-kāmadhenu-halāyudhāṃśca dharmakoṣaṃ
smṛtisāra-kṛtyasāgara-ratnākara-pārijātāṃśca /
ṭikāsahite dve saṃhite manu-yājñavalkyokte
vyavahāre tilakañca pradīpikāñca pradīpañca //
6. Vide p, 316, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. I.

pe riod, i.e. the first half of the twelfth century. But copies of this work became scarce in Bengal even in the 18th century, as is evident from the ludicrous remark of Śrīkṛṣṇa, quoted above, because of the wholesale incorporation of its contents in later works. The copious quotations by Śūlapāṇi, Govindānanda and Raghunandana, Caṇḍeśvara, Vācaspati and Vardhamāna, who flourished in Bengal or Mithila between the 14th and 16th centuries of the Christian era, amply prove the great influence this work exercised over the Bengal and Mithilā schools of Hindu Religious Law. The Oriental Institute of Baroda secured the Udaipur MS. in 1934 and entrusted the Late Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar with the work of editing this old, rare and important Smṛti work. The following eleven volumes of this work have so far been published by the above Institute under the editorship of the late Pri ncipal Aiyangar between 1941 and 1960, the year of the editor's death :—

Bra hmacāri-kāṇḍa, *Gṛhastha*°, *Niyatakāla*°, *Śrāddha*°, *Dāna*°, *Vrata*° (vol. I-VI), *Tīrthavivecana*° (vol. VIII), *Śuddhi*°, *Rājadharma*°, *Vyavahāra*° (vols. X-XII) and *Mokṣa*° (vol. XIV).

The *Rājadharma-kāṇḍa* has also been published in 1942 from Lahore under the editorship of Iagadish Lal Shastri.

b) Its non-utilization by Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa and his royal patron, Ballāla Sena.

Though the *Kṛtyakalpataru* has been profusely quoted by the *nibandhakāra*-s of Bengal and Mithilā and possibly of the rest of India from the 14th century onwards, yet it has not been so done by the Bengali *nibandhakāra*-s of the 12th century, such as Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa and his royal patron, Ballāla Sena. But the late M. M. Chakravarti says on p. 361 of his '*Contributions to the History of Smṛti in Bengal and Mithilā*' (J. A. S. B., vol. XI, 1915, pp. 311-406), 'Firstly in the Bengal School, Aniruddha was the earliest to quote the work (i. e. the *Kṛtyakalpataru*) as authority and Ballāla Sena's *Ācārasāgara*, *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara* and *Dānasāgara* seem to have felt its influence'. Two works of Aniruddha have so far been published, viz. *Hāralatā* (B. I., 1909) and *Pitṛdayitā* (Sanskrit Sāhitya Parishat, 1924). So it is likely that Chakravarti might have, at least consulted the printed edition of the former work, viz. *Hāralatā*, before making the above remark about Aniruddha's indebtedness to the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, as the former had been published six years before the publication of his above paper. But curiously enough, the index of the edition of the *Hāralatā* contains the names of *Asahāya*, *kāmadhenukāra*, *Govindarāja*, *Bhojadeva*, *Viśvarūpa* and *Śaṅkhadhara* only and not that of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* or of its author, Lakṣmīdhara in the list of commentators and digestwriters, quoted by it. We have also failed to find out any quotation from the last-named work and author in the *Hāralatā* even by a thorough examination. The same remark also applies to the *Pitṛdayitā*. No MS. of the *Ācārasāgara* and *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara* of Ballāla Sena have so far come to light and the published edition of the *Dānasāgara* of the same author contains, however, no quotation from the *Kṛtyakalpataru*. So the above remark of Chakravarti about Aniruddha's and Ballala Sena's indebtedness to the last-named digest is totally unfounded.

Twenty-six years after the publication of Chakravarti's paper and fifteen years before that of the *Dānasāgara*, Rao Bahadur Rangaswami Aiyangar also says on p. 59 of his introduction to the edition of the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* (G. O. S., vol. XCII, 1941), 'The *Dānasāgara* of Ballāla Sena (composed in Śaka 1091, i.e. A.D. 1161-69 [sic. 1169-70]) refers to the *Kalpataru*'. Though the learned editor quotes in Appendix B of the above edition the 72 introductory verses in full and the five concluding verses of the *Dānasāgara* and simply prints with a waving line the Sanskrit word *kalpadruma*, occuring in introductory verse 3 of the above work, yet he nowhere proves his above assertion. The Sanskrit phrase in question, viz., *kalpadrumo jaṅgamaḥ*, occuring there is an epithet only to *hemantaḥ*, just following it and placed as it is in a verse of *double entedre*, it admits of a two-fold interpretation, viz. the *hemanta* (i.e. late autumn) season and the king Hemanta Sena, grandfather of the author, Ballāla Sena. This author, however, nowhere mentions any commentary or digest, not to speak of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, in his long list of works consulted and also nowhere quotes a single word from the abovementioned digest. Moreover, the word *kalpadruma* means a 'wish-fulfilling tree' only and though its synonym *kalpataru* may also be used as an abbreviation of the name of the digest in question and also be paraphrased into *kalpavṛkṣa* or *kalpadruma*, yet there is no warrant for introducing here this far-fetched interpretation of the innocent word *kalpadruma*, simply because the composition of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* preceded that of the *Dānasāgara* by a few decades (the two works having been produced in the first and second halves respectively of the 12th century).

c) The *Dānakāṇḍa*

Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane has devoted 52 pages (pp. 837-888) to *dāna* (gifts) in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. II, published in 1941. The late Rangaswami Aiyangar's edition of the *Dānakāṇḍa* has also been published in the same year with a big introduction, divided into two parts, viz. (I) Lakṣmīdhara and the *Kṛtyakalpataru* (pp. 1-56) and *Dānakalpataru* and evolution of the literature on gifts (pp. 57-129), the second part alone occupying 73 pages. Consequently, on account of the simultaneity of the publication of the above two works, Dr. Kane, who has devoted sec. 77 (pp. 315-318) to the *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. I, was not in a position to consult the printed edition of the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the same work but satisfied himself by consulting other published digests on *dāna* in the chapter on the same in the second volume of his History. Likewise Mr. Aiyangar has been deprived of the benefit of consulting with advantage the *dāna* chapter of Dr. Kane, from whose exhaustive list of the first volume of the above History he has received help in preparing the bibliography of *dāna* literature.[7] So we propose here to compare and contrast the *dāna* chapter of Kane with the second part of the introduction of the *Dānakalpataru* of Rangaswami for purposes of checking and bringing out the sum-total of the contributions of both to the *dāna* literature in general.

7. Vide p. XI, Preface to the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*.

To achieve our object, we first append below in a tabular form the several topics of *dāna*, treated by Kane along with the similar ones, treated by Rangaswami, noted against them, leaving out of consideration the special paragraphs, devoted by the latter to the *Dānakalpataru* alone.

Kane	Rangaswami
1. *Dāna* is a special feature of householders stage.	1. The praise of *Dāna*.
2. Gifts highly extolled in the *Ṛgveda*.	2. Vedic Literature on gifts. *Dānastuti*.
3. Gift of horses censured in some works.	
4. Gifts of land not favoured in very early times.	
5. Difference between *dāna*, *yāga* and *homa*.	5. Evolution of the *Dāna* doctrines.
6. Meaning of *iṣṭāpūrta*.	6. *Iṣṭāpūrta*.
7. All could make gifts (including women and Śūdras).	
8. Persons fit and unfit to be donors.	8. Who can be given a *dāna*; who cannot be given a *dāna*. Donors eligible without question.
9. What things could be donated and what not.	
10. Three classes of things that could be given.	
11. *Dāna*-s of three kinds, viz. *nitya*, *naimittika* and *kāmya*.	11. Classification of gifts.
12. Making gifts in secret eulogised.	
13. Certain gifts should not be spurned.	
14. Gifts of certain things forbidden.	14. Fit classes of gifts.
15. Proper times for making gifts.	
16. Generally gifts not to be made at night.	
17. Gifts at times of eclipses, *saṅkrānti* and *ayana* days specially recommended.	17. Gifts according to auspicious moments.
18. Proper places of gifts.	
19. Presiding deities of various articles of gift.	
20. General procedure of making gifts.	20. Lakṣmīdhara on *dāna* procedure. *Dakṣiṇā*. Other details of *dāna* ritual.
21. Kings were required to make various kinds of gifts to Brāhmaṇas.	
22. Spending money for marriages of Brāhmaṇas and setting them in houses highly eulogised.	
23. Gifts of land the most meritorious.	23. The gift of land.
24. Smṛti rules about landgrants followed in epigraphic records.	24. Epigraphic evidence of the practice of *Mahādāna*.
25. Verses deprecating the resumption of gifts made by earlier kings.	
26. Prior gifts to temples and Brāhmaṇas excepted in grants of villages.	
27. Taxes remitted in royal grants.	

Kane	Rangaswami
28. The eight *bhoga*-s in relation to land-grants.	
29. Discussion whether king is owner of all lands in the kingdom.	
30. Gifts called *mahādāna*-s described in Purāṇas.	
31. Sixteen *mahādāna*-s.	31. The *Mahādāna*-s.
32. Procedure of *Tulāpuruṣa* and other *mahādāna*-s.	
33. Gifts of cows highly extolled.	33. *Godāna*.
34. Gifts of ten kinds called *dhenus* such as of ghee, jaggery etc.	34 & 35. The *Acala* and *Dhenu* gifts.
35. Ten kinds of gifts called *parvata* or *meru dānas*, viz. of heaps of corn, salt, sesame &c.	
36. Establishing a pavilion for distributing water.	36. Provision of water.
37. Gift of books.	37. *Vidyādāna*.
38. Gifts for propitiating planets.	
39. Founding of hospitals.	39. *Ārogyadāna*.
40. Expiations for accepting gifts which should not have been accepted.	
41. When gift becomes irrevocable.	
42. Kinds of invalid gifts	
43. Gifts to *dharma* held void by modern courts.	

It will thus be seen that both—Kane and Rangaswami traverse over almost the same ground but it must be conceded that the treatment of the former, not being based upon any particular work but dealing with the subject in general, out of materials from many ancient and mediæval authorities, is more learned and interesting than that of the latter, who, though more prolix than the former, lacks method, arrangement and even accuracy. As regards lack of method, it may be said that in the above headlines of paragraphs, the latter author Rangaswami sometimes uses the words 'gift' and 'gifts' and sometimes '*dāna*' and though writing in English, sometimes puts down full Sanskrit expressions without giving their English renderings as headlines to his topics, e.g. *annadāna*, *abhaya-dāna*, *ārogyadāna*, *āśraya* and *pratiśraya*, *godāna*, *vidyādāna* etc. As regards lack of arrangement, it may be pointed out that instead of placing the two topics viz. 'Comprehensiveness of the *Dānakalpataru*' and 'Pre-*Kalpataru* treatment of *dāna*', just at the very beginning of the second part of his Introduction, the latter author could have done better by inserting them between the topics, viz. 'Growth of the literature of *dāna*, its imposing size' and 'Post-*Kalpataru* literature of *dāna*'. Again, he could have easily incorporated the subject-matter of the topic, entitled 'Digests anterior to the *Kṛtyakalpataru*' and included by him in Note B just after the second part of his Introduction, in his previously mentioned topic, viz. 'Pre-*Kalpataru* treatment of *dāna*'. As regards lack of accuracy, it will suffice to say that this edition of the *Dānakāṇḍa*, like its successor, the edition of

the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*[8] by the same scholar, bristles with dozens of wrong references, a few of which are set out below :

(1) In note 2 on p. 2 of the Introduction he says, with reference to the English version of Jolly's *Hindu Law and Custom* (*Receht und Sitte*), 'ed. Batakrishna Ghosh, Calcutta, 1928', which is, however, wrong and should be *'translated* by Batakrishna Ghosh, etc.'

(2) On p. 3 line 7 of the Introduction he puts the numeral I after the word *kalpataru* and adds in the corresponding footnote the phrase 'Printed in 1926 in Bibliotheca Indica', thereby committing two mistakes, viz. the numeral I should be placed after the word *kṛtyaratnākara* on l. 5 of the same page and the year 1926 should be corrected as 1925. Vide the *Kṛtyaratnākara* itself and also note 3 on p. 121 of the Introduction of the *Dānakāṇḍa* for the correct date of publication of the former work.

(3) In note 3 on p. 2 of the same he says, with reference to the short note on the *Kalpataru* in Manmohan Chakravarti's paper viz. *'Contributions to the history of Smṛti in Bengal and Mithila'*, 'J. A. S. B., 1916, pp. 311-375' and in note 1 on p. 18 of the same he refers to the same paper of Chakravarti by the following, 'J. B. A. S., 1916, p. 359'. The year 1916 in both the cases should be 1915 and the letters J. B. A. S. in the second reference should be corrected as J. A. S.B. It may be incidentally pointed out here that Chakravarti's above-mentioned paper, consisting of two parts in the same year's J.A.S.B., really ends on p. 406 and not on p. 375.

(4) In note I on p. 15 of the same, he says that 'the *Dānasāgara* was composed by Ballāla Sena in 1169 A.D.', on p. 59 he says that it was composed in Śaka 1091, i.e. A.D. 1161-69, on p. 71 he says that it was written in 1168 A.D. and in note I on p. 12 he writes (c. 1069 A. D.)' after Ballāla Sena. The year 1161 in the second reference and the years in the third and fourth references are wrong.

(5) On p. 71 of the Introduction he first describes Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa as the *purohita* (i.e. priest) of Ballāla Sena and then says on the same page that the latter was the disciple of the former, i.e. the former was the teacher (*guru*) of the latter. Priest and teacher are not the same and the fact is that the second statement of the learned editor is correct and the first is wrong. Vide the 6th introductory verse of the *Dānasāgara*, which reference also has been incorrectly quoted by the learned editor, as he says on the above p. 71, 'Inf. p. 338, sl. 4', whereas the verse in question occurs not only in the Asiatic Society (Calcutta) M.S. (I. A. No. 73) and the critical edition of the same by the present writer but also in the transcript of the introductory verses in the appendix of the *Dānakalpataru* (p. 338) as verse 6 and *not as verse 4*.

Dāna or gift, though a religious act, is also one of the five recognised modes of transfer of property, the other four being sale, exchange, mortgage and lease. So a treatment of this topic without relation to its legal character in present and past days is incomplete. It is, therefore, natural that Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane, who is a lawyer by profession and a

8. Vide the next sub-section for a critical examination of the above edition.

Sanskritist by inclination, has discussed the legal and administrative aspects of gifts in the following topics of his above chapter, viz. taxes remitted in royal grants, the eight *bhoga*-s in relation to land-grants, discussion whether the king is owner of all lands in the kingdom, when gift becomes irrevocable, kinds of invalid gifts and gifts to *dharma* held void by modern courts. But Rao Bahadur Aiyangar, not being a lawyer, has not only missed the above legal aspect of gifts in his bulky Introduction but has also sounded a note of dissatisfaction in the concluding lines of his topic, viz. Post-*Kalpataru* Literature of *Dāna* (pp. 71-75 of the Introduction), which run on p. 75 as follows :

'The legal aspects of gifts are more studied than their' ritualistic and mystic aspects. *Dāna* comes to occupy a minor place in the popular manuals of daily duties (*āhnika*). Its study partakes more the character of an antiquarian exercise than the cultivation of a subject of vivid and wide-spread interest. Its academic use is in its furnishing the background for the donative inscriptions, which virtually monopolise the extant epigraphic material.'

We shall now describe the utilization of the *Dānasāgara* of Ballāla Sena and the *Dānakriyākaumudī* of Govindānanda by both Kane and Rangaswami in their respective treatises. Both the *Dānasāgara* and *Dānakriyākaumudī* are Bengal works, belonging to the twelfth and sixteenth centuries[9] respectively. The former is not only one of the earliest works but the most valuable treatise on *dāna* and having been partly published almost half a century ago[10] and being consequently out of print for a long time, was taken up for republication in full by the Asiatic Society (Calcutta) with the present writer as the editor. It has in the meantime (1953-56) been published as work no. 274 in the *Bibliotheca Indica* with an English introduction and index. Another shorter edition of the *Dānasāgara* (pp. 1-2, 1-80, up to a certain portion of *dānapavāda*) in Bengali characters and with Bengali translation was also published in the *Sāhityasaṃhitā*, a Bengali journal of Calcutta. A copy of this edition was kindly supplied to me by my friend Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti. But the title-page, containing the name of the editor and the year of its publication, is missing in the copy. The latter is one of the latest work on *dāna* and has been critically edited by the late Mm. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha and published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* as early as 1903. Dr. Kane has assigned in the first volume of his History a section (viz. no. 83) to Ballāla Sena, in which he has described the

9. After describing 'the special treatises on *Dāna* of the early seventeenth century', including those of 'Mitra Miśra, Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha and his cousin Kamalākara', in the first five lines of p. 75 of the Introduction, Rangaswami says just below, 'The newer writers even on *Dāna*, like Govindānanda, concern themselves only with the *dānas* which have uses in the life of the average man.' Govindānanda who flourished a century earlier than the above three early seventeenth century writers, has been wrongly described as a newer writer on *Dāna*.

10. Edited in Devanāgarī characters with a Bengali introduction and a Bengali translation by Śyāmācaraṇa Kaviratna (pp. 1-16, 1-316) up to pañcalāṅgalakamahādāna, Calcutta (1914-1919).

contents of the *Dānasāgara* and *Adbhutasāgara*, the two extants of the same author. In describing the former he has consulted neither any MS. nor the partly printed Calcutta edition in Devanāgarī but has relied upon the description of the India office catalogue on the same. Though he has included in the second volume of his History (p. 841) the *Dānasāgara* among the six digests specially devoted to the topic of *dāna*, yet he has culled his information from the published editions or MSS. of five of them and has not supplemented his account from the *Dānasāgara*. He has also gathered stray information from three other works in MSS. (Vide the General Index, p. 1297). But Rao Bahadur Aiyangar consulted not only the partly printed Calcutta edition in Devanāgarī but also the Asiatic Society MS. of the same for the preparation of his elaborate Introduction of the *Dānakāṇḍa*. Though technically inaccurate in some places as pointed out above, yet Rangaswami's appreciation of the *Dānasāgara* is descriptive of the real worth of the same and it will not be out of place to reproduce it below :

'The *Dānasāgara*, the first considerable treatise on *dāna* after the *Kalpataru*, was written in 1168 A.D. (sic.). It is stated by Raghunandana with great approximation to probability, as really composed by Aniruddha, his *purohita* (sic.) and the author of *Pitrdayitā* and *Hāralatā*. The very full treatment of *prayoga-mantra*-s, arranged for each Vedic *śākhā* separately, which is the notable improvement on the *Dānakalpataru* made by *Dānasāgara*, is obviously the contribution of a *Vaidika* like Aniruddha. It may be noted that Ballāla Sena takes pride in the introductory verses prefixed to the *Dānasāgara* in describing himself as the disciple of Aniruddha (Inf. p. 338, sl. 4 (sic.), Vṛtrāreriva Goṣpatir (sic.) narapater asyāniruddo guruḥ)'.

Rao Bahadur Aiyangar has reproduced in Appendix B (pp. 337-344) of his above edition the first 72 verses, the last 5 verses, the colophon and the list of contents of the *Dānsāgara*. Dr. Kane has mentioned only the *Dānakriyākaumudī* without describing its contents, in his section (no. 101) on Govindānanda, extending a little over a page in the first volume of his History but has done sufficient justice to the same by copious quotations from it in the *Dāna* and *Pratiṣṭhā* chapters and by a single mention of it on p. 212, chap. VI on *Saṃskāras* in his second volume. All the references and quotations from the D. K. K. are set out below :

2nd vol. of H. D.

1. p. 212n=pp. 205-206 of the D.K.K. (quotations from the *Kapilapañcarātra* for 30 names of the fires).
2. p. 842=pp. 7-8 of the D. K. K. (quotations from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* for examples of the method of acceptance).
3. p. 842n=p. 2 of the D. K. K. (quotation of the text of Devala, defining a gift).
4. p. 854n=p. 11 of the D. K. K. (quotation of a text of the *Agnipurāṇa* about *dakṣiṇā*).
5. 855=pp. 5-6 of the D. K. K. (quotations from the *Kapilapañcarātra* for the names of the presiding deities of the several articles that are donated).

6. p. 855n=pp. 14-15 of the D. K. K. (for the procedure of making gifts).
7. p. 885=pp. 84-85 of the D. K. K. (quotation of passages from several Purāṇas, condemning the acceptance of gifts at several places and the gifts of several things and animals).
8. p. 891n=pp. 175-176 of the D. K. K. (quotation in full of the ten verses for sacrificing in fire ten oblations of clarified butter).
9. p. 892=p. 160-181 of the D. K. K. (for a very comprehensive procedure of the consecration of wells, ponds and tanks).
10. p. 892n=p. 166 of the D. K. K. (for the definition of *pratiṣṭhā*, i.e. consecration).
11. p. 892n=p. 167 of the D. K. K. (for the formula of the *saṃkalpa*, i.e. resolve).
12. p. 892n=p. 179 of the D. K. K. (for the formula of the *utsarga* i.e. dedication),
13. p. 893n=p. 126 of the D. K. K. (for the discussion of the right of the dedicator of a reservoir of water to use it himself after dedication).
14. p. 893n=p. 126 of the D. K. K. (for the classification of reservoirs of water).
15. p. 893n=pp. 132-133 of the D. K. K. (for the auspicious times of the consecration of wells and tanks).

We shall now describe Rangaswami's utilization of the *Dānakriyākaumudī* :

1. p. 57 lines 18-23 and note I of the *Dānakalpataru* (original quotation from D. K. K. in note 1 of the above page and its English translation on the body of the page).[11]=p. 86 of the D. K. K. (grounds for omission of the *mahādāna* etc. from it).
2. p. 78 note 1 of the D. K.=p. 124 of the D. K. K. (definition of *utsarga*, i.e. dedication).
3. p. 78 note 2 of the D. K.=p. 3 of the D. K. K. (definition of *dāna*)
4. p. 78 note 3 of the D. K.=p. 2 of the D. K. K. (a stricter definition of the same).
5. p. 80 lines 13-20 and note 2 of the D. K. (English translation on the body of the above page and only page reference in the note)=p. 3 of the D.K.K. acceptance necessary to complete a gift).
6. p.81 lines 6-8 of the D.K.=pp. 5-7 of the D.K.K. (enumeration of *dravya devatā*-s,[12] following *Viṣṇudharmottara*[13]).

---

11. Then in note 2 on the same page Rangaswami writes, 'Govindānanda's date is 1500-1540 A. D.' The numerals 1 and 2 are placed on the body of the above page after 'Govindānanda Kavikaṅkaṇācārya' (l. 18) and just at the end of the whole sentence (l. 23) respectively. So it is evident that the numerals should mutually change their places, as the note regarding Govindānanda's date is fitly connected with the mention of his name in l. 18 and the note containing the Sanskrit original, with its English translation, ending in l. 23.
12. Vide the 5th quotation from D.K.K. in H. D., vol. II, for the meaning of the word.
13. Not *Viṣṇudharmottara* alone but also and mainly *Kapilapañcarātra*.

(d) The *Tīrthakāṇḍa*

The *Tīrthakāṇḍa* is the second published volume of the Kṛtya-Kalpataru (1942), the first being the *Dānakāṇḍa*, described above. The text portion and appendices of this volume cover 301 pages, while the preliminary matter covers 92 pages, the Introduction alone running up to 80 pages. Though the learned editor has referred to and discussed the views of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* of Vācaspati Miśra in his exhaustive Introduction, yet he has nowhere attempted a study of Vācaspati Miśra's indebtedness to Lakṣmīdhara Bhaṭṭa, so far as the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* and the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* are concerned.

In attempting to ascertain the above indebtedness, we must first compare the *sāmānya-vidhi* (i.e. the chapter on general remarks about pilgrimage) of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* with the *tīrtha-yatrā-vidhi* (i.e. the chapter on the procedure of starting on a pilgrimage) of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*. The *sāmānya-vidhi* chapter of the former work covers the first 17 pages, while the corresponding chapter of the latter work covers 9 pages only (pp. 3-11). The matter of the first 6 pages of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* is an almost exact copy of the same of pp. 3-9 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*, with the exception of a long extract from the *Mahābhārata* (from the middle of p. 6 to the beginning of p. 8 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*), though only four lines[14] of this extract have been quoted on p. 15 of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*. The matter from the middle of p. 10 to the middle of p. 11 and a verse,[15] occurring at the end of p. 13 and beginning of p. 14 of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*, are also an almost exact copy of the same on p. 10 and first half of p. 11 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*. The matter, quoted below[16] and occurring on pp. 13 and 14 of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*, is found with a slight variation on the last half of p. 11 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*. The *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* on p. 8 quotes seven lines[17] as *matsyapurāṇe mārkaṇḍeyavākyam* and adds[18] that the *kalpataru* is of opinion

---

14. Bhīmānāmapi tīrthānāṃ......puṇyatā smṛtā //
15. Pratikṛtiṃ kuśamayīṃ tīrtha-vāriṇi majjayet /
majjayettu yamuddiśya so'ṣṭabhāgaṃ phalaṃ labhet //
The editor, Rangaswami, reads *prakṛtiṃ* for *pratikṛtiṃ* in the above verse, which reading not only offends against the metre but is also meaningless. That it is not a misprint is proved by its being quoted on p. 298, appendix G, index of *pratīkas*, of the same volume.
16. Ataeva gayāyām ekasmin dine nānātīrthaprāptau tannimittakāni nānāśrāddhādīni /... tīrthopavāso viśeṣārtho na tvāvaśyakaḥ—tīrtham abhigamya.........svastimāṃśca bhavati / itidevalavacanāt /
17. Kathayiṣyāmi te vatsa......yānaṃ vivarjayet //
18. Ayaṃ ca yāna-niṣedhaḥ prayāga-mātraparaḥ tatprakaraṇa eva matsyapurāṇasya śrutatvāditi kalpataruḥ /

that this prohibition of conveyances holds good in the case of Prayâga only, as the above lines of the *Matsyapurāṇa* have been quoted in the topic of Prayâga. The above seven lines of the *Matsyapurāṇa* are found on p. 141 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* in the chapter of *Prayāga-tīrtha-yātrā-vidhi.* But there is an additional line[19] in the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* between the second and third lines of the same quotation in the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi,* which means 'he who is desirous of starting on a pilgrimage to Prayâga.' Though there is not a single line of prose comment within this *Prayāga-tīrtha-yātrā-vidhi,* covering 13 pages (pp. 141-153) and consisting of quotations from the *Matsyapurāṇa* only for 12 pages, yet Lakṣmīdhara says elsewhere [20] that owing to the absence of any prohibition of conveyances in pilgrimage to places other than Prayâga, there is no sin in reaching those places in a conveyance. It will thus be seen that almost the entire portion of the *tīrtha-yātrā-vidhi* of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* has been incorporated in the *sāmānya-vidhi* of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi.*

The learned editor says,[21] 'Among writers on tīrtha, Vâcaspati Miśra deals more fully with Gayâ than others. The *Tīrthacintāmaṇi,* like the *Tīrthaprakāśa,* has absorbed the entire section from Lakṣmīdhara's• work and reproduced it verbatim (op. cit. pp 268-280). The respect that Vâcaspati and Mitra Miśra[22] held for Lakṣmīdhara's work is evident from his placing the *kalpataru* with the Vāyu and Garuḍa Purāṇas among his authorities.' The chapter on Gayâ covers 12 pages (pp. 163-174) only of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* while the same covers 71 pages (pp. 268-338) of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi.*

Vâcaspati has acknowledged his indebtedness to the *Kalpataru* not only in the second introductory verse (p. 1) of his *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* but also in the introductory verse (p. 268) of the chapter on Gayâ of the same. He has also added the phrases, viz. '*iti Kalpataru-tīrtha-kāṇḍe gayā-māhātmyam*' and '*iti Kalpatarau Vārāṇasī-māhātmyam*' on pp. 280 and 368 respectively of his above work. The learned editor has not attempted to examine that indebtedness in the Vârâṇasī portion of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa,* which is a big one, covering 124 pages (pp. 12-135) but has done so in the Gayâ portion, which is a very brief one, covering 12 pages only (pp. 163-174). But though he has examined that indebtedness by identifying three only of the many long quotations, yet his page-references[23] of

19. Prayâga-tīrtha-yâtrārthī yaḥ prayāti naraḥ kvacit /
20. Atra prayāga-vyatirikta-tīrtha-gamane yâna-niṣedha-pramâṇa-darśanânna tīrthântare yāna-gamane virodhaḥ, p. 11 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa,* we should read °pramâṇâdarśanânna° for °pramâṇa-darśanânna°, as the above sentence, as printed, is meaningless.
21. P. lxxxv, Introduction, *Tīrthakāṇḍa.*
22. The words 'and Mitra Miśra' are obviously wrong from considerations of grammar and sense and should, therefore, be struck out from here.
23. (a) In footnote I, p. 163, he says, 'cited in *Tīrthacintāmaṇi,* p. 269 as from *kalpataru,*' where p. 269 should be p. 268.
(b) In footnote, p. 169, he says, '*Tīrthacintāmaṇi,* pp. 273-274', where pp. 273-274 should be pp. 275-277.

the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* of two of them are wrong. Another reference in footnote 1 on p. 166 (*Gayā* chapter) of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* is also wrong. The learned editor places the number I after the word *bhavān*, occurring in the verse, viz. 'etasmāt kāraṇād raibhya bhavān dhanyamayocyate / sakṛdgayā ... prapātanam //' (lines 8-9, p. 166) and adds in the corresponding footnote, 'This verse is placed after line 2 above in the *Tīrthacintamaṇi*.' But though the second line of the above verse is quoted on p. 272 of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*, yet the first line is nowhere quoted in it. A verse,[24] the first line of which is somewhat similar in the beginning with the same of the above verse, is quoted both in the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* (lines 4-5, p. 166) and in the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* (ll. 5-6, p. 272). The quotation of the same in the latter is just before the verse, viz. 'tīrtha-prabhāvād yatnena brahmaghnasyāpisattama / pituḥ piṇḍapradānena kuryād uddharaṇaṃ sutaḥ //' This verse, with a slightly different reading (viz. tīrthaprabhāva eṣo' tra°) has been quoted as lines 2-3 on p. 166 of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*. So the number I should be placed against the verse, viz. 'etasmāt kāraṇāt putra° (vide note 24) and the matter in the footnote I should be corrected as 'this verse is placed *before* line 2 above in the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*.'

In the bibliography[25] of treatises on *tīrtha*, the learned editor has enumerated 47 works on *tīrtha* and indicated the places and years of publication of eight published works among them, along with an asterisk placed against the names of three of them. But though Raghunandana's *Śrī-puruṣottama-tattva* has been published in 1895 from Calcutta by Jīvānanda (*Smṛtitattva*, vol. II, pp. 563-73) and has beed referred to as such by the learned editor in footnote 3, p. xli of his Introduction, yet he makes no mention of the fact of its publication, in his above Bibliography. Similarly, though Vidyāpati's *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī*[26] has been published from Calcutta in 1940, two years before the publication of the present section of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, yet the learned editor has classed it among unpublished works.

Though the Vārāṇasī portion of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* covers 30 pages only and is thus less than one-fourth in bulk of the same portion of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*, covering 124 pages (pp. 12-135), yet the former work has missed nothing important and has, moreover, created order out of the unwildly mass of quotations in the latter work from several purāṇas, including the *Liṅgapurāṇa*.[27] There is no division of topics in the Vārāṇasī

24. Etasmāt kāraṇāt putra aham etau pragṛhya ca / (vigṛhya tu)
    āgato'smi bhavantaṃ vai iṣṭaṃ yāsyāmi sāmpratam //
25. Appendix F, pp. 293-4.
26. Edited by the late Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri as Vol. IV in Vols. III and IV of his series viz. 'The contribution of women to Sanskrit Literature.' The editor attributes the authorship of this work to the queen Viśvāsadevī, who patronised Vidyāpatī. For a discussion of the authorship of Vidyāpati of this and many other works, vide the section on Vidyāpati below.
27. Fourteen chapters of this Purāṇa have been almost fully quoted, viz. 3rd, 5th-11th and 13th-18th.

as well as in other portions of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* but the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* bristles with such division of topics in every chapter, including that on Vārāṇasi. The enumeration of the topics of the Vārāṇasi chapter of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* will not, therefore, be out of place here. They are the following :

Measurement of the area of the holy spot of Vārāṇasi, merits of entering into Vārāṇasi, of residing in it, of doing so up till death, of dying in it and of bathing and doing similar other pious acts in it and merit and procedure of worshipping the phallic emblems in it. We give in the Appendix (D) the identification of the unidentified portions of the Gayā chapter and the entire Vārāṇasi chapter of the two works, viz. the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* and the *Tīrthakāṇḍa*.

II. Caṇḍeśvara Ṭhakkura (1310-1360 A.D.)

The *Ratnākaras*

(a) His own account of himself and of his royal patron, Harasiṃhadeva.

MM. Dr. P.V. Kane says on p. 370 of his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I. (1930), that 'we learn a great deal about the family and personal history of Caṇḍeśvara from his works.'. He then collects information about the same from the author's introductions and colophons of the printed editions of the *Vivādaratnākara*, *Kṛtyaratnākara* and *Rājanītiratnākara* and from Mitra's Notices of the MSS. of *Vyavahāraratnākara* and *Dānaratnākara*. Though the *Gṛhastharatnākara* of this author was published in 1928, he has not utilized the printed edition but consulted the incomplete Deccan College MS. of the same, which has only folios 30,72-113 and has thus failed to supply the additional information, contained in its introductory verses. Though there is an incomplete MS. of the *Śuddhiratnākara* of the same author in the Government collection of the Asiatic Society (Calcutta), covering 97 folios in the Bengali script and containing four of the introductory verses, Dr. Kane has not used it. Besides utilizing the historically important verses at the end of the *Dānaratnākara* MS., noticed by Mitra, he has also fallen back on the Deccan College MS. (No. 114 of 1885-86) of the same. We, therefore, wish to take up the matter, as gathered from various works of this author, one after another, with a view to supplementing the information of Dr. Kane, regarding the personal history of Caṇḍeśvara and of his royal patron, Harasiṃhadeva, in the light of further editions, MSS. and studies.

(I) *Kṛtyaratnākara*

Though this work contains 26 introductory and two concluding verses of high poetic merit and genuine historical information, Dr. Kane has satisfied himself by referring to and utilizing partial matter of the introductory verses 10 and 15 only. The subject-matter of the 26 introductory verses turns out on analysis to be divided into the following sub-headings :

Verses 1-3 : Invocation to Śiva, to the Supreme God and to *Dharma*,
,, 4-8 : Harasiṃhadeva,[28]
,, 7-6 : Devāditya,
,, 9-12 : Vīreśvara,
,, 13-26 : Caṇḍeśvara [political (13-17), relating to munificence (18 and 20), relating to the great taṇk (21-23) and relating to the *Kṛtyaratnākara*

28. The late Dr. K. P. Jayaswal pointed out in his Introduction to the *Rājanītiratnākara* that the correct name of the king was Harasiṃhadeva, though verse 4 (in some MSS.) of the *Kṛtyaratnākara* gives the name as Harisiṃhadeva.

(24-26), the verse 19 being simply a paraphrase of a part of the verse 13].

Of the two concluding verses, the first is an apology to the readers for the defects of a work and the second is simply self-applause.

All the introductory verses except the first three are historically important and we wish to give below their purport for a better understanding of the subject in view. "There is a king of the name of Harasiṃhadeva, who destroyed his enemies to the last man, who was sprung from the Kārṇāṭa dynasty and who ruled over the entire Mithilā and who sprinkled over the directions spotless fame, just as the autumnal moon, which confers innumerable good on others, sprinkles nectar-like rays over the same. When this king was out in his conquests, the *śeṣa* serpent, with its thousand hoods bent down and meeting one another closely owing to the pressure of the king's forces, resembled the body of the lotus-stalk, just closed, after the sun, the friend of the lotuses, had gone down the western sea. Let not the unfortunate *cakravākas*, suffering from the fear of the misfortune, caused by the anger of the god of Five Arrows (i.e. the god of Love), become dejected on account of the friend of the lotuses (i.e. the sun) having gone to the sea (i.e. having set), for the effulgence of the crest-jewel of the king of the Kārṇāṭa dynasty, having pleased all the worlds, is on the ascendancy.

"Devāditya, of cheerful disposition and a veritable moving celestial tree, the lustre of whose counsels dispelled the rise of the darkness-like foes and who purified the earth by the Gaṅgā-like flow of his unalloyed fame, resembling the autumnal moon, filled the unique office of the minister of peace and war of this king. He satisfied the Brāhmaṇas by *mahādānas* (such as the *tulāpuruṣa* and other great gifts), entailing lavish display of wealth and the gods by many kinds of sacrifices and pleased the black-bees, humming with intoxication by the draught of the honey of the lotuses, by the excavation of large ponds and benefited the earth by the construction of pleasure-gardens.

"Just as the moon came out of the ocean, the god Brahman from the lotus, new nectar from the moon and material prosperity from praise-worthy policy, so in this world Vīreśvara, the best among the ministers, was born to this ocean of merits and lover of power. This Vīreśvara enriched the best Brāhmaṇas by lavishly bestowing great gifts, heaped one upon another, being himself determined to do so, gave away *Rāma* and other grants of land to learned Brāhmaṇas and dug a lake, which resembled the sea in extent. This extremely worthy person built a high palace in the city of Dahivata, which excelled the enemy's fort and was fitted with beautiful staircases and approaches. He, being possessed with many abilities in the arts of peace and war, rendered the burden of royalty of the king of Mithilā free from enemies with his prowess and also filled it with wealth and with the seven expedients by virtue of his good policy. Whether in the meeting of the wise and eloquent, or in the assembly of kings and ministers, or in the heart of the suppliants and poetry of the good poets, Vīreśvara still exists with his world-wide fame.

"Let this Vīreśvara's son, Caṇḍeśvara, who is like a new wish-fulfulling tree, reared

up by the watering of good spies of the kingdom and who occupies the office of a good minister of peace and war, attain prosperity. When this minister was out in his conquests, the earth was lowered down by the pressure of his forces, the pitchy darkness of the nether world was removed by the rays of the partial lamps, displaced from the gem on the hood of the foremost head of the king of serpents and the serpent wives, having thus got an opportunity of seeing their beloved ones and thereby reaping temporarily the utility of their eyes, begin to sing his praise. Is not he, the best minister Caṇḍeśvara, who invaded Nepal, inaccessible owing to hills, who, being equal to the enemy of the sun-god (i.e. *Rāhu*) by dint of his prowess, dethroned all its kings of the Rāghava dynasty by the might of his arms and who worshipped the god *Paśupati*, the bestower of immense boons, by touching the idol, an object of universal adoration on this earth ? The frightened kings of Nepal, being defeated by him, forgot their origin in the solar dynasty and either fled to the mountain caves or disappeared in the forests, took shelter near the great water-falls or reached the precipices, when the extensive battle-field, disturbed by the feet of horses, was furrowed by the wheels of chariots and irrigated with the fat of elephants ; and pearls, resembling date-palms and fallen from the back of the elephants by the strokes of arrows, looked like so many seeds of fame of the minister, sown on the earth. When the wish-fulfilling tree of heaven was deserted by the supplicants, who were honoured by this crest-jewel, as it were, of the highly munificent (i. e. Caṇḍeśvara) by the bestowal of great gifts, far in excess of their expectations, the former, being rendered black as a row of black-bees or ink or flame, was weeping, as it were, by the trickling down of drops of honey from its body. This best of minister, having been delighted, gave away to the Brāhmaṇas a good many villages, equalling the city of gods and green with forests of plantain trees—villages in which black-bees, attracted by the pleasing smell of the opening mango-blossoms, were humming and which thus resembled full-blown lotuses by reason of the waters of the encircling rivers.

"This Caṇḍeśvara excavated a lake in Abhirāmapura, which was shining with lotuses and making sounds of clouds by the passing of gentle breezes over it and thus created the illusion of the autumnal clouds, surcharged with water and floating on the sky. This lake, with its surging waters,resembling those of a sea, was, as if, saying the following words as proudly as an infuriated elephant or ass does in yelling :

'O you, the sage, born of a pitcher (i.e. Agastya), you have drunk off the ocean, full of saline water, by one sip of your hand. Come, if you can, to drink myself, sweeter than the ocean-water as I am.'

"The moon-god worshipped the god Śiva with a desire to surpass the fame of this lake and though it reached almost the position in the crest of the latter god, yet it did not drive the desired result from him. So his mind melted and he (i.e. the moon), with his subdued lustre, thus holds, as it were, within himself spots, equal to the marks of mud."

The purport of the verses 24 and 25 have already been given above in section

I (a), viz. 'The *Kṛtyakalpataru* : its place etc.' The verse 2◆ means that this scholarly author (i.e. Caṇḍeśvara) has reconciled the conflicts among the many Vedas, various Smṛtis, numbers of Purāṇas and other authoritative works such as the History of Gauḍa (i.e. Bengal) and compiled this *Kṛtyaratnākara* for the benefit of the readers.

(II) *Gṛhastharatnākara*

Of the twenty-one introductory verses of this work, the first is an invocation of benediction from the god Śiva, who became a *gṛhastha* (i.e. householder) after marrying the daughter of the presiding god of the Himalayas and the second only supplies some information regarding the personal history of the author. The rest 19 verses enumerate the topics, dealt with in the body of the work.

The purport of the second verse is given below :

'Caṇḍeśvara, the most renowned in the long list of minister and practising celibacy, who taught many persons of the twice-born classes the entire Vedas with the six auxiliaries, satisfied them with gifts of money and initiated them into the life of householders, is laying down a treatise named *Ratnākara* (lit, sea) on the duties of *gṛhasthas* (i.e. householders), based on the principles of the *Pūrva-*) *Mīmāṃsā* (i.e. the Science of Interpretation).'

(III) *Śuddhiratnākara*

Of the four verses existing in the incomplete MS. of the *Śuddhiratnākara*, the first invokes benediction from the god *Nīlakaṇṭha* (a name of the god Śiva) and the second only supplies some information regarding the personal history of Caṇḍeśvara. The remaining two begin with the enumeration of the topics, dealt with in the body of the work. The purport of the second verse, which is faulty at places, is to the following effect :

'Caṇḍeśvara, the best of the ministers of the king of Mithilā and the foremost of orthodox persons, who performed sacrifices with the help of pure and proper money along with the discharge of duties viz. daily, casual and voluntary, is composing this beautiful book, entitled *Śuddhiratnākara* (lit. 'sea of purification').'

(IV) *Vivādaratnākara*

The concluding verse of this work states that 'he (i.e. Caṇḍeśvara) weighed himself against a heap of gold and gave the gold away, before the god Somanātha on the bank of the Bagmatī in the bright fortnight of the month of *Agrahāyaṇa* (November-December) of the śaka year 1236(=1314 A.D.).' MM. Smṛtitīrtha has quoted the above Sanskrit verse and explained its implications on p. VI of the preface to his edition of the *Kṛtyaratnākara* in 1925 and Dr. Kane has referred to it in the section on Caṇḍeśvara of his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I, in 1930. It may incidentally be stated that the *Vivādaratnākara* has been twice published in the B.I., in 1887 under the editorship of Pandit Dīnanātha Vidyālaṅkāra and in 1931 under that of MM. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha.

(b) The *Kṛtyaratnākara*

(I) Its conception of *dharma*

The *Kṛtyaratnākara*, before prescribing the religious duties of a Hindu, appropriate to the twelve months of the year, devotes some 38 pages (p. 7-44) to the 'determination of *dharma*', divided into four topics, viz. definition (*svarūpa*), effects (*phala*), sources (*pramāṇa*) and requisites (*nimitta*). In defining *dharma* it quotes a text of Manu (II. 1),[29] which says that people are to follow that *dharma*, which is practised by persons, who are learned, honest and are always devoid of passion or hatred and which is respected by them in their very hearts. It next quotes a text of *Viśvāmitra*[30] to the effect that *dharma* is that, the practice of which is applauded by persons, conversant with the scriptures and *adharma* is that, the practice of which is decried by them. It then quotes a lengthy passage of *Āpastamba*,[31] which means that determination of *dharma* is a difficult thing and *dharma* is the practice of the good, the polite, the aged, the unavaricious and the prideless persons. It last quotes a text of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*,[32] which says that *dharma* is the means of attaining prosperity. It then explains[33] the term *dharma* as applicable to its three kinds, viz. daily, casual and voluntary. It then further subdivides it on the authority of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*[34] into *varṇadharma*, *āśramadharma*, *varṇāśramadharma*,

---

29. vidvadbhiḥ sevitaḥ sadbhir-nityam-adveṣarāgibhiḥ /
hṛdayenābhyanujñāto yo dharmas-taṃ nivodhata //
30. yam-āryāḥ kriyamāṇaṃ hi śaṃsantyāgamavedinaḥ /
sa dharmo yaṃ vigarhanti tam-adharmaṃ pracakṣate //
31. na surā no gandharvā no pitaro 'yaṃ dharmo' yamadhar-ma iti /......sarvajana-padeṣvekānta-samāhitam āryā-ṇāṃ vṛttaṃ samyag-vinitānāṃ vṛddhānām evam alolupānām adāmbhikānāṃ vṛttasādṛśyaṃ bhajetaivam ubhau lokāvabhijayatīti /
32. dharmaḥ śreyaḥ samuddiṣṭam śreyo' bhyudayasādhanam /
33. ayañca dharmośabedo nityaṃ naimittikaṃ kāmyamityādyagrimānusāreṇa kriyāpara iti boddhavyam.
34. sa tu pañcavidaḥ prokto vedamulaḥ sanātanaḥ /
varṇadharmaḥ smṛtastveka āśramānām ataḥ param /
varṇāśramas tritīyastu gauṇa naimittikas tathā //
varṇatvam ekam āśritya yo dharmaḥ saṃpravartate /
varṇadharmaḥ sa uktas tu yathopanayanaṃ nṛpa /i

guṇadharma and *nimittadharma* and exemplifies the above five classes on the same authority as follows :—

'Investiture with the sacred thread' (*upanayana*) is an instance of *varṇadharma*, because only the three twice-born classes (*varṇas*) are entitled to it. 'Begging and carrying a staff' is an instance of *āśramadharma*, because it is resorted to in the fourth stage (*āśrama*) of a man's life. 'Wearing the girdle made of *muñja* grass' is an instance of *varṇāśramadharma*, because it is prescribed for the members of the twice-born classes at the time of their *upanayana*, which marks their entrance into the first stage of life, viz. *brahmacarya* (i.e. studenthood). 'Protection of the subjects by a duly installed king' is a *guṇadharma*, because it is concomitant with royalty which is an attribute (*guṇa*), while expiation (i.e. *prāyaścitta*) is a *nimittadharma*, whereas it relates to a particular incident (*nimitta*), viz. incurring of sin.

It then lays down on the authority of the *Manusmṛti* (I. 88-91) and *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* the duties peculiar to the four castes (*varṇas*), which are to the effect that reading, teaching, making sacrifices, officiating in others sacrifices, taking gifts and making gifts are the six-fold duties of a Brāhmaṇa, protection of subjects, making gifts, making sacrifices, reading and control of passions are the five-fold duties of a Kṣatriya, tending cattle, making gifts, making sacrifices, reading, trade, usury and cultivation of lands are the seven-fold duties of a Vaiśya while the only duty of a Śūdra is the ungrudging service of the three higher castes.

The duties, common to all the castes, have been collected by our author from the Kalikāpurāṇa, Nārada, Bṛhaspati, Viṣṇupurāṇa, Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, Mahābhārata, Devala, Yājñavalkya (I. 8), Devīpurāṇa, Manu (VI. 91-92) and Dakṣa. The quotation from the *Kalikāpurāṇa*[35] is to the effect that *Iṣṭa* and *Pūrta* are the *dharmas* sanctioned by Smṛti and also by Śruti as handed down by tradition, that *Iṣṭa*, which means 'sacrifice', confers worldly pleasure only and that *Pūrta*, which means 'consecration of idols and reservoirs of water', confers both pleasure and salvation on the person, who performs the same.

---

yas tvāśramaṃ samāśritya adhikāraḥ pravartate /
sa khalvāśramadharmastu bhikṣādaṇḍādiko yathā //
varṇatvam āśramatvañca yo' dhikṛtya pravartate /
sa varṇāśramadharmas tumauñjīyā mekhalā yathā //
yo guṇena pravarteta guṇadharmaḥ sa ucyate /
yathā mūrdhābhiṣiktasya prajānāṃ paripālanam //
nimittam ekamāśritya yo dharmaḥ sampravartate /
naimittikaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ prāyaścittavidhir yathā //

35. iṣṭāpūrtau smṛtau dharmau śrutau tau śiṣṭasammatau /
pratiṣṭhādyantayoḥ pūrtam iṣṭam yajñādilakṣaṇam /
bhukti-mukti-pradaṃ pūrtaṃ iṣṭaṃ bhogārthasādhanam //

The quotation from the *Viṣṇu(-purāṇa)*[36] purports that forgiveness, truthfulness, control (of desires), cleanliness, charity, control of the organs (of senses and actions), abstinence from killing creatures, serving one's teacher and preceptor, visits to places of pilgrimage, pity, straightforwardness, absence of avarice, worshipping gods and Brāhmaṇas and absence of malice are the *dharma*, common to all the castes. The quotations from the rest are, more or less, paraphrases of the above two quotations.

It then devotes three sub-chapters to the effects, sources and requisites of *dharma* respectively.

In the sub-chapter on the effects of *dharma*, the quotations from the *Taittirīya Śruti*, *Manusmṛti* (II. 9), *Vaśiṣṭha* and *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* are significant. The quotation from the first[37] means that *dharma* is the support of the whole world, people resort to those who practise it, vices are cleared away by it, so they call *dharma* as the best. The quotation from the second[38] purports that a man derives fame in this life and exquisite happiness in the next one (after death) by practising *dharma*, as laid down in the Śruti and the Smṛti. The quotation from the third[39] is to the effect that the person, practising *dharma*, becomes praiseworthy in this world and attains heaven in the next. The quotation from the fourth[40] states that the practice of daily duties is necessary without any end in view, that of voluntary ones with a particular end in view and that of casual ones for the removal of vices.

Of the quotations in the sub-chapter on the sources of *dharma*, those from *Manu*, *Yājñavalkya*, *Mahābhārata* and *Hārīta* are important. The quotation from *Manu*[41] (II. 6) is to the effect that the Vedas, the Smṛtis, good behaviour (*śīla*), the conduct of the good, who are conversant with the above and the unanimous verdict of the learned in a religious

---

36. kṣamā satyaṃ damaḥ śaucaṃ dānam indriyanigrahaḥ /
ahiṃsā guruśuśrūṣā tiīrthānusaranaṃ dayā //
ārjavaṃ lobhaśūnyatvaṃ devabrāhmaṇapūjanam /
anabhyasūyā ca tathā dharmaḥ sāmānya ucyate //
37. dharmo viśvasya jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā, loke dharmiṣṭhaṃ prajā upasarpanti, dharmeṇa pāpam apanudati, dharme sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhitaṃ tasmād-dharmaṃ paramaṃ vadanti /
38. śruti-smṛtyuditaṃ dharmaṃ anutiṣṭhan hi mānavaḥ /
iha kīrtim avāpnoti pretya cānuttamaṃ sukham //
39. Dhārmikaḥ hraśasyatām eti loke pretya ca svargabhāk bhavati /
40. phalaṃ vināpyanuṣṭhānam nityānām iṣyate sphuṭam /
kāmyānāṃ svaphalārthantu doṣaghātārtham eva ca /
naimittikānāṃ karaṇaṃ trividhaṃ karmaṇāṃ phalam //
41. vedo' khilo dharmamūlaṃ smṛtiśīle ca tadvidām /
ācāraścaiva sādhūnām ātmanas-tuṣṭireva ca //

problem—are the sources of *dharma*. The quotation from *Yājñavalkya*[42] (I. 7) means that Śruti, Smṛti, good customs and one's own discretion in the case of a conflict of the scriptures—are the sources of *dharma*. The interpretation of the term *śīla*, occurring in the above text of *Manu*, has been taken by our author from the *Mahābhārata*[43] to make the meaning clear. It is to the effect that the learned call the non-infliction of injury on all creatures either by mind or by speech or by action, showing favour to them and knowledge as *śīla*. *Hārīta*'s[44] interpretation of this very term has also been appended by him just after the above interpretation of the *Mahābhārata*. It means that *śīla* is of thirteen kinds, viz. (1) identification of the individual self with the Supreme self, (2) adoration of the gods, (3) adoration of the Fathers, (4) comeliness, (5) absence of the habit of mortifying others, (6) absence of malice, (7) mildness, (8) absence of harshness, (9) friendship, (10) sweet-speaking habit, (11) gratitude, (12) offering shelter to others and (13) salutation (to superiors), and that these are as authoritative as customs.

He then quotes a further text of *Yājñavalkya*[45] (I. 3) to the effect that the four Vedas, the six auxiliaries of the Vedas, the Purāṇas, the Nyāya, the Mīmāṃsā and the (metrical and aphoristic) Dharmaśāstra works are the fourteen sources of knowledge and of *dharma*. Our author then quotes a text of *Jābāla*[46] to the effect that in the case of a conflict between the Śruti and the Smṛti, the former should be respected. The citation from *Gautama*[47] purports that in the case of a conflict between two texts of Smṛti, either of them may be respected.

The last sub-chapter on the requisites of *dharma* opens with a prose passage of *Śaṅkhalikhita*,[48] which means that the requisites of *dharma* are proper place, time, procedure, the requisite article, devotion, person and sacrifice, and that *dharma* with devotion and person stands in need of proper time, which is secured when the proper

42. śrutiḥ smṛtiḥ sadācāraḥ svasya ca priyam ātmanaḥ /
samyak saṅkalpajaḥ kāmo dharmamūlam idam smṛtam //
43. adrohaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ karmaṇā manasā girā /
anugrahaśca jñānañca śīlam etad-vidur-budhāḥ //
44. brahmaṇyatā devapitṛbhaktatā saumyatā aparopatāpitā anasūyatā mṛdutā apāruṣyaṃ maitratā priyavāditā kṛtajñatā śaraṇyatā praṇatiśceti trayodaśavidhaṃ śīlam etasyācāravat prāmāṇyam /
45. purāṇa-nyāya-mīmāṃsā-dharmaśāstrāṅga-miśritaḥ /
vedāḥ sthānāni vidyānāṃ dharmasya ca caturdaśa //
46. śruti-smṛti-virodhe tu śrutireva garīyasī /
avirodhe sadā kāryaṃ smārtaṃ vaidikavat sadā //
47. tulyabalavirodhe vikalpaḥ /
48. tatra dharmalakṣaṇāni—deśaḥ kāla upāyo dravyaṃ śraddhā pātraṃ tyāga iti samasteṣu dharmodayaḥ sādhāraṇo' nyathā viparītaḥ /......śraddhā-pātra-sampanno dharmaḥ kālāpekṣaḥ śraddhā-dravyotpattiriti kālaḥ /

article is associated with devotion. This sub-chapter ends with a text of *aśiṣṭha*,[49] which means that *dharma* is that which is practised and customs are those which are followed in the *Āryāvarta*' i.e. in the area intervening between the Himālayas and the Vindhyas.

(II) *Khañjana-darśana*

Khañjana-darśana or sight of the bird *Khañjana* (wagtail) is a peculiar Hindu omen, recorded in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* (pp. 366-373). Though it is also recorded in later works viz. Govindānanda's *Varṣakriyākaumudī* (pp. 449-51) and Raghunandana's *Tithitattva* (103-4), yet those treatments cover one or two pages only and as such, are less comprehensive than that of the present work, consisting of seven pages. We, therefore, give below a synopsis of this treatment in view of both its earlier and more detailed character.

"One should perform the *śānti*, called nīrāja, in the eighth or twelfth *tithi* or on the full-moon day of the month of *Āśvina* or *Kārttika*. After the conclusion of the *nīrājaśānti* ceremony by the king, the enemy, if chased by him in the direction of the flight of the *khañjana* bird, is fast subdued. This bird is first seen when the sun is in the asterism of *Hastā* and vanishes when the sun reaches that of *Rohiṇī*. That kind of *Khañjana*, which is fat, possessed of a long neck and a black throat and is dark from the neck and mouth is beneficent and fulfils all the desires of the observer ; while that other kind of *Khañjana*, which has a dark spot on the throat and the tips of whose hands and feet are white, is called *citrakṛt* and that, which is excessively yellow, is called *gopīta* (*gomūtrapīta* ?) and these two classes add to the misery of the observer. There are four kinds of *Khañjana* birds, viz. *samantabhadra*, *prabhadra*, *anubhadra* and *ambarabhadra*. That kind, which is dark on all sides of the neck, breast and head, is called *samantabhadra*, while that kind, which has dark head and breast but white neck and back, is called *prabhadra*. That kind, the neck and breast of which only are dark, is called *anubhadra*, while that kind, with a dark line in the neck, is called *ambarabhadra*. Of the above four kinds, the immediately preceding one excels the succeeding one in the matter of conferring success on a good action. That kind of *ākāśabhadra* (i.e. *ambarabhadra*), which has a dark line on the neck but a white face, brings about failure of designs. That kind, which resembles yellow juice in colour and is hence called *gomūtra* (the same as the *gopīta*), if seen in the morning, predicts miseries to the observer for the period of one year.

The *Khañjana* bird, if seen on a curd vessel or a stack of paddy, confers good, while that, seen on quagmire, predicts good grass and that, which is found on the dung of a bull, foretells the profusion of cow's milk. If seen on grass, *sakaṭa* tree, house-top, face of a person and *śuci* tree, it predicts the acquisition of clothes, sale of the country, failure, imprisonment and disease respectively. If found on the back of a goat or of a sheep, it indicates the speedy meeting with one's beloved ones. But if it is seen seated on the

---

49. ... dakṣiṇena himavataḥ uttareṇa vindhyāt ye ācārās-te pratye-tavyāḥ /

bone of a dead buffalo, camel or ass, in a burning place of dead bodies, corner of a house, or on sand, wall, ashes or hair, it foretells evil and brings about death, disease and fear. If it shakes its wings or drinks from a water-course, it is inauspicious. Generally, it is auspicious, if seen at the time of sunrise but not so, if found at the time of sunset.

The places, where it performs sexual intercourse or vomits or voids its ordure, abound with gems, glass and coal respectively and the soil is to be dug in those places to unearth those curiosities. Its dead, wounded, diseased and bleeding condition predict the self-same states of the observer. If it is found falling to the ground from its accustomed height, it forebodes wealth to the observer, while if found soaring in the sky, it indicates future union with one's nearest relations. If it is seen in the morning on lotuses, cows, elephants, horses and big serpents, it predicts a kingdom to the observer ; if fouud on unsoiled grass, it indicates good news ; while if found on ashes. bones, wood, nails, hairs and husk, it entails misery upon the observer for the period of one year. But if found seated in the morning on elephants, sheep, *śāla* groves, balconies of palaces, curd vessels and clean soil, or over gold and winnowing fans used for kings, or in the clear sky, or on good shady trees with rich foliage and bent down with fruits, the *Khañjana* confers prosperity on the observer. If again it is seen in the morning sit very suddenly and in a happy mood on a river-bank, a lotus, cow-dung, the tail of a cow, *dūrvā* grass, royal palace, the topmost room of a house, *jambāla* fruit, new leaf, *kṣīra* tree, household materials, or on the main arch such of a house, it is then highly auspicious for the acquisition of water, food and drink, dear ones, cows, horses and cloths and for recovery from diseases. Its position on a boat predicts the acquisition of a house to the observer. But if it is shown by another person, that second person secures the company of a woman. If found on unploughed soil or on a stack of paddy, in the morning or in the sky, it foretells marriage, acquisition of paddy, union with one's dear ones and also with one's near ones respectively. If it is seen alighting from the sky, it indicates sufficient wealth ; if found eating and drinking, it foretells the acquisition of food and drink ; while if observed in other beautiful positions in the morning, it surely confers similar other desirable results on the observer. If it is found following an ass, a camel or a dog, or breaking its wings, it predicts death on the observer ; and if it is found shaking its wings in the evening, or tied or dead, it forebodes evil. The observer as well as the intending traveller meets with the positions, good or bad, as attend the *Khañjana* bird in the morning. If seen in the south when the star *Agastya* is on the horizon, this bird fulfils the desire of the observer, who should, therefore worship it with a mantra and bow down to it with the head for the attainment of the good result, indicated by it. The sight and the utterance of the name of this bird are equally auspicious and if it is seen going in a revolving fashion, the desire of a traveller is fulfilled. The following mantra is to be uttered at its sight :

'O you, the son of a sage, practising *yoga*, you disappear with the advent of summer but reappear after the close of the rains, I bow down to you, *Khañjana*, who are full of wonders.'

The *Khañjana* bird, seen in an ugly body in a bad place, doing reproachable acts, must then be worshipped by the observer, particularly for the removal of the vices, indicated by it. The observer should abstain from sexual intercourse and flesh-eating, lie down on the bare ground, bathe, mutter mantras, offer oblations to fire and worship the bird for the period of seven days.

(III) Its indebtedness to Ballāla Sena

We propose to discuss here the indebtedness to Ballāla Sena of Caṇḍeśvara and, as we shall see later on, of his *Kṛtyaratnākara* alone. This Ballāla Sena was a Hindu king of Bengal, reigning between 1158-1179 A.D. and produced at least five works on dharmaśāstra, two of which viz. *Adbhutasāgara* and *Dānasāgara* have been published[50] and the remaining three of which viz. *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara*, *Ācārasāgara* and *Vratasāgara* are known only from references[51] in one of his published works. The 72 introductory verses of the India office MS. of the *Dānasāgara*, recorded in its Descriptive Catalogue, helped Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane to draw pointed attention of scholars in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I, (p. 340), to the invaluable merit of the *Dānasāgara* in checking the contents of the extant Purāṇas. He also advised younger scholars on p. 162 of his above work to fix the chronology of the Purāṇas. Dr. R. C. Hazra acted up to his advice by consulting the India office MS. of the aforesaid work which helped him to check the contents of the extant Purāṇas, establish the chronology of the Puranic chapters and produce his *Studies in Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* in 1940. But neither Dr. Kane nor Dr. Hazra utilized or even mentioned Pandit Śyāmācaraṇa's partly printed edition of the *Dānasāgara* (vide note 10 above), which had been published in *Devanāgarī* script and earlier than the works of both.

Now as Caṇḍeśvara has quoted in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* no other work of Ballāla Sena than the *Dānasāgara*, our study will concern itself with the enumeration and identification of the quotations from the D. S. in the K. R. The index to the K.R. (p. 641) contains five entries against the D.S. and six against the *sāgara*, which is an obvious abbreviation of the name *Dānasāgara* and we have found out twenty-seven more quotations from the *Sāgara* or the *Dānasāgara* in the *Kṛtyaratnākara*. The *paribhāṣā* chapter of the former work (pp. 51-69) corresponds so closely to the same chapter of the latter work (pp. 45-79) in the enumeration and arrangement of topics, quotation of texts and comments that the whole chapter of the K. R. seems to be a faithful copy of the corresponding chapter of the D. R. with slight variations. So the mention of the several

50. The *Dānasāgara*, which has been fully published in 1956 by the present writer, was partly published twice earlier (see above in the *dānakāṇḍa* subsection). The *Adbhutasāgara* was published from Benares in 1905 (see below, note 156).
51. The *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara* and *Ācārasāgara* have been mentioned in introductory verses 55 and 56 (p. 6 of the present writer's edition) and the *Vratasāgara* on pp. 52 and 59 (of the same edition).

topics of the *paribhāṣā* chapter of the two works in a tabular form will not be out of place here, [In the following Table are given the pages of D. S. first and the corresponding pages of K.R. are indicated by the sign =]

1.	Paribhâṣâ in general—pp. 51-55=pp. 45-50	
2.	„	for expiatory rites for small lapses—pp. 56-57=pp. 50-52
3.	„	for rites for invalid persons—pp. 57-58=pp. 52-53
4.	„	for rites for fasting—pp. 58-59=pp. 53-57
5.	„	for rites for nocturnal eating—pp. 59-60=pp. 57-59
6.	„	for rites for oblation to the sacred fire—pp. 60-62=pp. 59-62
7.	„	for rites for muttering prayers—pp. 62-64=pp. 62-65
8-9.	„	for articles and grains—pp. 64-65=pp. 65-69
10-12.	„	for eighteen kinds of rice, all grains and all scents—pp. 65-66=pp. 69-71
13-15.	„	for gems, flavours and minerals—p. 66=pp.71-72
16.	„	for substitutes in the absence of principal articles—pp. 67-68=pp. 73-76
17.	„	for weights and measures—pp. 68-69=pp. 76-77
18-19.	„	for incense and light—wanting in D. S.=pp. 77-79

So it will be seen that not only the (*Kṛtya-)kalpataru*, *Kāmadhenu* and *Pārijāta*, as admitted by the author but also the *Dānasāgara* was mainly utilized by him in the K.R.

Vide the Appendix (E) for the identified quotations from the *Dānasāgara* in the *Kṛtyaratnākara*.

(IV) Its indebtedness to Srīdatta

Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane has devoted sec. 89 (pp. 363-5) of his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I., to Śrīdatta Upâdhyâya and has said on p. 365, "The *Samayapradīpa* is mentioned in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* (pp. 400, 479 and 505) of Caṇḍeśvara and in Śūlapāṇi's *Durgotsava-viveka*. Śrīdatta is more frequently quoted in the *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī* of Govindânanda than almost any other author or work." The above statement of Dr. Kane does not contain an exhaustive list of the authors or works quoting Śrīdatta, as the latter is also quoted by Vācaspati Miśra in his several *Cintāmaṇis* and by Raghunandana in his several *Tattvas*. But we are concerned here only with Caṇḍeśvara's indebtedness to Śrīdatta, as both belonged to Mithilā and as the latter 'flourished a short time before the former and must have composed his works between 1275 and 1310 A.D.' (loc. cit.), while 'the literary activities of Caṇḍeśvara extended for about 50 years from 1314' (op. cit.. p. 372). The *Kṛtyaratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara was published (B.I., 1925) just five years before the publication of Dr. Kane's above volume. But though he has utilized in it the information about Caṇḍeśvara's quoting the *Samayapradīpa*, from the index (p. 641) to the K.R., yet he has not traced the quotations in the Deccan College MS. of the former (No. 371 of 1875-76), which MS. he has otherwise fully utilized in his description not only of Śrīdatta Upâdhyâya (pp. 363-5) but also of Dhāreśvara Bhojadeva (pp. 275-9). So we propose to

trace here those quotations from the *Samayapradīpa* in the K. R. and thus establish Caṇḍeśvara's indebtedness to Śrīdatta, which is an interesting phenomenon in the history of Dharmaśāstra literature in view of the fact that both Śrīdatta and Caṇḍeśvara belonged to the same part of the country and were not separated by any appreciable interval of time.

Though the index to the K.R. contains eight entries against the S. P., yet Dr. Kane has stated three only in his remark quoted above and the present writer has succeeded in finding out two more quotations from the latter work in the former (pp. 233, 510). Śrīdatta has also been quoted once in the former work (p. 68) but the quotation is from his other work *Sandhyāprayoga*, as stated therein. The *Gṛhastharatnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara has also quoted twice (pp. 195, 203) *Śrīdattāhnika*, i.e. Śrīdatta's work on Āhnika, which may be the *Chandogāhnika*, said to be one of Śrīdatta's works (Kane, op. cit., p. 364). The present writer has identified all the above ten quotations from the S. P. in the D. C. MS. of the same. Before describing these identifications, the present writer wishes to make two short remarks. One of them is that the first chapter of this work is not called '*Samaya-pariccheda*', as stated by Dr. Kane but '*Samaya-pradīpa prathamaḥ paricchedaḥ*' (vide folio 31a). The other is that the correct from of the name, somewhat indistinct on folio 7a of the D.C. MS. and appearing to be '*Mitāmitrādibhiḥ*', is '*Jitāmitrādibhiḥ*', as the whole extract, beginning with '*yadi tu ekādaśīm upavaset*' and ending with '*prapañcitaṃ Jitāmitrādibhiḥ*', has been quoted by Raghunandana in his *Ekādaśītattva* (pp. 45-46) with the words '*tathā ca samayapradīpe Śrīdattopādhyāyāḥ*' and '*ityāhuḥ*', added just before and after the extract respectively.

The first quotation from the S. P. occurs in the *Śrāvaṇakṛtya* of the K.R. (p. 233) and is to the effect that the S.P., after quoting the first only of the previously written verses, has said that bitter, pungent, sour and sweet things are eaten in order. This quotation is found on folio 36a of the MS. of the S.P. The second and third quotations occur in the *kārttikakṛtya* of the K.R. (pp. 400, 401) and are found on folios 9b and 17b respectively of the MS. of the former. The second is the interpretation of a text on the grains allowed in a *haviṣya* diet and the third is the mention of the fact that the word *bahiḥsnāyī*, occurring in a text on p. 400, has been read as *nityasnāyī* in the S.P., which has interpreted *nityasnāna* as *prātaḥsnāna* on the authority of *Śaṅkha*. The fourth quotation occurs in the *Pauṣamāsakṛtya* of the K.R. (p. 479) and is found on folio 47a of the MS. of the S.P. It is to the effect that the S.P. is of opinion that cakes (*apūpas*) are to be taken by the *Chandogas* and *Vājasaneyas* according to their Gṛhyasūtras, while vegetables (*śāka*) by the Kaṭhas and that those whose Gṛhyasūtras contain no specific prescription may optionally take both cakes and vegetables. The fifth and sixth quotations occur in the *Māghakṛtya* of the K.R. (pp. 505, 509-510) and are found on folios 16b and 47b-48a respectively of the MS. of the S.P. The fifth quotation is to the effect that according to the S.P. the procedure (*itikartavyatā*) of the *vrata*, referred to above, is derived from the previous words, beginning with '*māghamāse tu yo brahman.*' The sixth

quotation is rather a long one and covers the whole of p. 509 and runs up to the first six lines on p. 510. It is found in the MS. of the S.P. (from folio 47b to folio 48a) and concerns itself with the detailed rites of *māghasaptamī*. The seventh quotation occurs in the *Phālgunakṛtya* of the K.R. (p. 522) and is found on folio 49b of the MS. of the S.P. It is the mention of a different reading in the S.P. of a text of the *Bruhmapurāṇa*, quoted just above and our author adds that the reading of the S.P. is different from that, adopted by the *Kṛtyasamuccaya Kalpataru* and others. The eighth quotation occurs in the *Prakīrṇakṛtya* of the K.R. (p. 540) after the verse *'tilodvartī......nāvasīdati'* and is found on folio 50b of the MS. of the S.P. It is to the effect that the S.P. is of opinion that the above general prescription about the six-fold application of sesame really holds good in one's birth-day ceremonies. The ninth and tenth quotations occur in the *Vratacintā* section of the K.R. (pp. 633, 637) and are found on folios 3a and 6b to 7a of the MS. of the S.P. The ninth is the definition of the word *vrata* by the author of the S.P. and is to the effect that *'vrata* is a continuous resolve, regarding one's religious duties' and the tenth is the decision of the S.P., in case one *tithi* falls on two days.

Vide the Appendix (F) for the quotations.

(c) The *Gṛhastharatnākara*
(Supplementary portion of its text)

Dr. Kane has utilized in the first volume of his History (sec. on Caṇḍeśvara) the incomplete D.C. MS. (No. 44 of A 1883-84) of the *Gṛhastharatnākara*, as said above but has only referred to the printed edition of 1928 in Appendix A (p. 539) but not utilized) it in his above volume. But the second volume of his *History af Dharmaśāstra* (1941 contains not less than a hundred quotations and translated extracts from the printed edition. The frequency of these quotations and translated extracts can be best inferred from the fact that he has shortened in the list of abbreviations the name of the work into Gṛ R. and *gṛha. ra* (in Devanāgarī script) for the text and foot-note portions respectively. He has followed this process of abbreviation in the cases of two other nibandhas only. That he has ignored nothing important of the Gṛ R. in his second volume can be proved by the fact that he has utilized the interpretation[52] of the former (p. 279) of the words *pṛṣṭhe vāstuni* (*Manu* III. 91), along with that of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, a commentator of *Manu*, of the same. The Gṛ R. contained 68 *taraṅgas* or chapters, as is evident from the last line of the last introductory verse[53] (no. 21) of the printed edition of the same (p. 3).

52. Gṛ R. says, *'pṛṣṭhe vāstuni* paścādgṛhe mūttroccāra-karaṇa-sthāna ityanvayaḥ' i.e. "the words *pṛṣṭhe vāstuni* should be interpreted as 'at the back of the house near the latrine'," while Kulluka says, 'gṛhasyopari yad-gṛhaṃ tat pṛṣṭha-vāstu', i.e. "*pṛṣṭha-vāstu* means 'an apartment over another' (i.e. attic of a house."

53. aṣṭa-ṣaṣṭir-amī sṛṣṭhs-taraṅgāś-cittaraṅgadāā //

But this printed edition, though containing on the cover the words 'complete work', is really incomplete, as it finishes with chap. 65 on *tyājyātyājya* and the post-colophon of the MS. *ka*, collated for the edition, adds the following line :

avaśiṣṭaṃ bhāratādi-śravaṇañca ādarśābhāvānna likhitam (i.e. 'the remaining chapters such as *bhāratādiśravaṇa* have not been copied owing to their absence in the model MSS.'). The two other MSS. of the Gṛ R., collated for the present edition, were also wanting in these three last chapters. So it appears that all the three MSS. are copies of the same incomplete original. Though Dr. Kane has said in his section on Caṇḍeśvara (Vol. I, p. 306), 'The Deccan College MS. that I could consult is incomplete, has only folios 30, 72-133 and contains the last 23 *taraṅgas* only', yet I find on examination of this very MS. (now deposited in the library of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute of Poona) that the folio 30 contains a fragment only of the *taraṅga* on *pakṣiṇaḥ*,[54] while the remaining folios (72-133) cover full 21 *taraṅgas* and a small portion of the *rakṣoghnācāravarṇana-taraṅga* (the penultimate *taraṅga*), the ultimate *taraṅga* on *bhāratādiśravaṇa*, being altogether omitted in this MS. So we see that of the missing three *taraṅgas*[55] of the printed edition, which ends abruptly on p. 591 with the text of Viṣṇu[56] in the *tyājyātyājya-taraṅga*, only the entire *ṛṇāpakaraṇa-taraṅga* and a little portion of the *rakṣoghnācāra-varṇana-taraṅga* can be had from the Deccan College MS., which also contains the end of the *tyājyātyājya-taraṅga*, which appears to be missing in the printed edition :

It may be added in conclusion that Dr. Kane has given a short description of the contents of the Gṛ R., extending over nearly a paragraph on p. 166 of his Marathi work *Dharmaśāstra-vicāra*.

Vide the Appendix (G) for the text of the recovered supplementary portion.

(d) The *Śuddhiratnākara*

This work of Caṇḍeśvara is as yet unpublished. There is an incomplete MS. (No. 3826),[57] consisting of 97 folios only with gaps, in the Government of India collection

---

54. From *kalaviṅkaṃ kalaṃ haṃsaṃ* (p. 371 of the printed text) to *pārāvata-kapotau ca abhakṣyāḥ* (p. 372 of the same).
55. ṛṇāpakaraṇañcātha rakṣoghnācāravarṇanam /
 śravaṇaṃ bhāratādīnāṃ vidhānañca prakīrtitāḥ // (introductory verse, 20)
56. (a) bhāryā putraśca bandhuśca saṃsṛṣṭaḥ pāpakarmabhiḥ /
 paribhāṣyo' parityājyaḥ patito' pi tathaiva ca // (as read in the printed edition).
 (b) bhāryā putraśca śiṣyaśca saṃsṛṣṭaḥ pāpakarmabhiḥ /
 paribhāvyaḥ parityājyāḥ patito' pyanathā bhavet // (as read in the D.C. MS.)
57. Vide p. 73, Descriptive catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. III, (Smṛti) by MM. Haraprasad Sastri, published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1925.

of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. The present writer has made a transcript of this MS. and used it for this sub-section. Another incomplete and incorrect MS.[58] of the same work, consisting of 118 folios, has been described in the Mithilā catalogue. The present writer has found on p. 38 of his copy the beginning[59] of the Mithilā MS. But the end of that MS. could not be traced in the present writer's copy, as the Society's MS. ends in an earlier portion of the work. Though Caṇḍeśvara's three other parts of his *Smṛti-ratnākara* and the *Rājanīti-ratnākara* have already been published, as stated above and though this *Śuddhi-ratnākara* is another important work, yet it has not yet seen the light of day. Its great importance in the dharmaśāstra literature can be somewhat realised from the fact that Raghunandana, the great Bengal *nibandhakāra* of the 16th century, has quoted many times from it in his *Śuddhitattva*. This latter work quotes from many metrical Smṛtis, Purāṇas, digests and commentaries. But though quotations from all other digests are once or twice in each case, the *Hāralatā* of Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa has been quoted in the S. T. 44 times and the works of Caṇḍeśvara 27 times, the quotations from the *Śuddhiratnākara* alone being at least eleven times, once with the specific mention of the full name of the work and ten times with that of its abbreviated name, viz. *Ratnākara* : (Vide pp. 190-98 of the Appendix of the present writer's monograph viz. *Raghunandana's Indebtedness* etc. for the quotations from all the works of Caṇḍeśvara, including the *Śuddhiratnākara*).

It will be seen that Raghunandana principally laid the *Hāralatā* of Bengali Aniruddha and the *Śuddhi-ratnākara* of the Maithila Caṇḍeśvara under contribution in producing his *Śuddhitattva*. Aniruddha, who was prior to Caṇḍeśvara also by two centuries, has been quoted by the latter also in his present work. The present writer's copy (pp. 39, 48 and 6) contains three quotations from the *Hāralatā*, the former two by the specific mention of its name and the third as '*anye tu......ityāhuḥ*'. The first quotation[60] is found on p. 75 of the *Hāralatā*. The second quotation,[61] which is the mention of the reading *asapiṇḍānām* in the *Hāralatā* for *sapiṇḍānām*, is found on p. 84 of the H. L. with the simple change of *apiṇḍānām* for *asapiṇḍānām*. Our author adds that the reading of the H. L. is a better one in the text, cited by him beforehand. The third quotation[62] is

58. Vide p, 436, A descriptive catalogue of (Sanskrit) MSS. in Mithilā', Vol. I, Smṛti Manuscripts, by K. P. Jayaswal and A. Banerji-Shastri, published by the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna, 1927.
59. (samā-)nagrāmīyo'tra samīpavāsī pārijāte tu itareṣvācāryeṣu upādhyāyādiṣu /
60. Hāralatākārastu—tat-putra ācāryaputraḥ sa ca yadyadhyāpayati tathā tanmaraṇe trirātram / adhyāpayan gurusuto guruvan-mānamarhati / iti *manu* (II. 208b) darśanāt /
61. Hāralatāyām asapiṇḍānām iti pāṭhaḥ sa tu sugamaḥ /
62. anye tu sarvakarmānītyadṛṣṭārtha-daiva-pitrya-karmaparam ityāhuḥ / (H. L. reads sarvakarmanityadṛṣṭarthānām daiva-paitrāṇām karmaṇām upasaṅgrahārtham).

found with a slight modification on p. 21 of the H. L. after the text of Paiṭhinasi, occuring on p. 26 of the same and also quoted by our author.

But curiously enough, Govindānanda, though quoting the *Hāralatā* and Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa several times in his *Śuddhikaumudī*, a cognate work on ceremonial impurity, never quotes the *Śuddhiratnākara* or simply *Ratnākara* in his above work. He was not, however totally ignorant of the *Ratnākara*, which is mentioned twice (pp.59 and 474) in his another work, viz. the *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī*. But as the word *Ratnākara*, mentioned in it, presumably refers to other works of Caṇḍeśvara and not to the *Śuddhiratnākara* owing to the difference of the subject-matter of the *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī*, the present writer has refrained from comparing the quotations with his copy.

Enough has been said to prove that the *Śuddhiratnākara* is a very important work of the Mithilā School of Hindu Religious Law and, quoted as it has been in Raghunandana's *Śuddhitattva* a considerable number of times, it exercised a great influence over the Bengal school also and that it supplies the missing link between the *Hāralatā* and the *Śuddhitattva*, Bengal *nibandhas* of the 12th and 16th centuries respectively.

(e) The *Dānaratnākara*

Dr. Kane utilized extracts of the *Dānasāgara* from the India Office Catalogue and the Deccan College MS. (No. 114 of 1884-86) of the *Dānaratnākara* in appropriate places[63] of the first volume of his History, which also contains the important fact that 'the work (i.e. the *Dānasāgara*) is mentioned in the *Dānaratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara'.[64] The same author has not, however, utilized the *Dānasāgara* in the second volume of his History but simply mentioned it as one of the 'digests specially devoted to the topic of *dāna*' on p. 841 of the same. He has also not used the *Dānaratnākara* in his above volume in the chapter on *dāna* but consulted the D.C. MS.[65] in an earlier chapter (on p. 131, footnote 290) for

63. Th D. S. extracts have been utilized in sec. 83 on Ballāla Sena, pp. 340-341. The third introductory verse and the last concluding verse of the D.R. have been quoted on p. 366 in sec. 90 on Caṇḍeśvara. The verses are :
    (a) śrutoktam api yad-dānaṃ kṛtyaratnākare punaḥ /
    māsādi-kṛtya--sāmastyaṃ gauravat-tad-udīritam //
    (b) śrī-kṛtya-dāna-vyavahāra-śuddhi-pūjā-vivādeṣu tathā gṛhasthe /
    ratnākarā dharmasu ye nibandhā kṛtāḥ śrī-caṇḍeśvara-mantriṇā te //
    Dr. Kane reads *gṛhastha-kṛtye* for *tathā gṛhasthe* in the latter quotation, following the almost similar verse of the *Vivādaratnākara*.
64. Op. cit., pp. 340-41.
65. Though Dr. Kane has obviously consulted fol. 10a of the above MS., yet he has not mentioned the folio reference. This quotation from Devala also occurs in the D.S. pp. 18-19.

a quotation from Devala about eight kinds of Brāhmaṇas (of whom each succeeding one is superior to each preceding one), viz. *mātra*, *brāhmaṇa*, *śrotriya*, *anūcāna*, *bhrūṇa*, *ṛṣikalpa*, *ṛṣi* and *muni*. He has, however, utilized in his 1st vol. the second and fourth verses[66] at the end of the *Dānaratnākara*, not from the above-mentioned Poona MS. but evidently from Mitra's Notices, Vol.VI, p. 135.[67] The same author, though completely silent about Ballāla Sena and the *Dānasāgara* in his Marathi work *Dharmaśāstra-vicāra*, has allotted same four lines to Caṇḍeśvara, including a quotation[68] from the *Dānaratnākara* on p. 43 of the same. He has also devoted nearly a paragraph to the *Gṛhastha-ratnākara* on p. 166 of the same work, as stated above.

As the subjects dealt with in the *Dānasāgara*, divided into 75 *āvartas* (or chapters), have already been described by the present writer in his Introduction to its edition (pp. XXXVII-XL), so he now proposes to enumerate below the subjects of the *Dānaratnākara*, containing 29 *taraṅgas* (or chapters) only :

The procedure followed in making gifts, meaning of dāna, what may or may not be gifted, fit objects of charity, the sixteen kinds of gifts called *mahādānas*, gifts of a thousand cows and of heaps of corn etc., the latter constituting the ten *parvata-dānas*, gifts of ten kinds of *dhenus* such as of jaggery, ghee etc., gifts of cows, oxen, golden effigies of cows, gifts of land, gold etc. and antelope hide, various gifts such as those of food, books etc., gifts appropriate to certain months, seasons, *tithis* and *nakṣatras* (i.e. asterisms), founding of hospitals and offering protection to intimidated persons, settling Brāhmaṇas in houses, miscellaneous gifts, dedication of wells and tanks for public use, planting of trees, offering shelter and enumeration of the presiding deities of various articles of gift.

A comparison of the topics, dealt with in the *Dānasāgara* and the *Dānaratnākara* will convince the readers that the authors of both these works traverse over almost the same ground and that unlike Govindānanda,[69] a later digest-writer, Caṇḍeśvara does not dispense with the description of the sixteen *mahādānas* and the ten *parvata* (or *acala*) *dānas*, as being impossible for ordinary persons.

Though the *Dānaratnākara* quotes the *Dānasāgara* not less than fifteen times

66. magnā mleccha-mahārṇave vasumatī yenoddhṛtā līlayā / (2nd verse)
yasya dānātirekeṇa loke nirjita-gauravaḥ /
kalpadrumaḥ pārijātaḥ kāmadhenuḥ kvacit kvacit // (4th verse)
67. None of these verses is found in the Poona MS. and Dr. Kane has given the above reference in connection with the latter verse, though he has added nothing in connection with the former.
68. The same as that quoted as the 2nd verse in note 66 above.
69. tulāpuruṣādi-ṣoḍaśamahādānāni dhānyācalādi-daśa-vidhācaladānāni matsyapurāṇoktāni mahārājetarāsadhyānyatropekṣitāni mahādānapaddhatau draṣṭavyāni / anyāni ca dānāni yathāyatham ākareṣūhyāni / (p. 86 of the *Dānakriyākaumudī*).

yet the present writer concludes this sub-section after identifying only one of those quotations without undertaking the unnecessary task of identifying all of them.

D. R.		D.S.
(folio 71a of the D.C. MS.)		(pp. 583 and 644 of the printed edition)
Kunmâṣa īṣad-svinnaḥ māṣaḥ svalpamâṣa iti sāgaraḥ.	=	(1) Kunmâṣo rājamāṣaḥ (diff. reading—° paścimadeśe râjamāsaprasiddho vrīhiviśeṣaḥ, which is almost the same as the reading of K. R. (p. 592), as quoted from D.S.) (2) Kunmâṣo rājamâṣa iti prasiddhaḥ (diff. reading—° svalpamâsa°).

III. Vidyāpati Upâdhyāya (1375-1450 A.D.)

The late Rai Bahadur Manmohan Chakravarti in his long paper, covering 96 pages, viz. '*Contributions to the History of Smṛti in Bengal and Mithilā*'[70] devotes almost three pages (pp. 390-92) to Vidyâpati Upâdhyâya and refers to his twelve works, of which six are on Smṛti, viz. *Gaṅgā-vākyāvalī*, *Dānavākyāvalī*, *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī*, *Varṣakṛtya*, *Vibhāgasāra* and *Saivasarvasvasāra*, while the rest six on other topics, viz. *Kīrtilatā*, *Bhūparikramagrantha*, *Puruṣaparīkṣā*, *Kīrtipatākā*, *Padāvalī* and *Likhanāvalī*. Chakravarti says that of these twelve works, the *Kīrtipatākā* is an amatory poem in Maithili, in the time of Śivasiṃha and that one characteristic feature of Vidyāpati's works is that they were written under the patronage of one or other member of the royal family of Kāmeśvara ; and that in some instances the works were even attributed to them. He then cites the instances of the three Smṛti works, viz. *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī*, *Śaivasarvasvasāra* and *Dānavākyāvalī*, the first two of which were attributed to the queen Viśvâsadevī and the third to the queen Dhīramatidevī. Chakravarti fixes 1395 to 1440 A.D. as the period of the literary activity of Vidyāpati.

Mr. Basanta Kumar Chatterji is perhaps the second scholar to write an informing paper[71] on Vidyāpati, covering 32 pages. He has first described all the above works of Vidyāpati except his *Padāvalī* and then dealt with the *Padāvalī* at great length. Though it seems that he has consulted the same MSS. of the works of Vidyâpati and arrived at the same conclusions as done by his predecessor, Chakravarti, yet he has dissented from the view of the latter in assigning the period of the literary activity of Vidyāpati, which extends in his opinion[72] from about 1405 to about 1448 A.D. One of

70. J. S. B., Vol. XI(1915), pp. 311-406.
71. Journal of the Deparment of Letters, Calcutta University, vol. xvi (1927), pp. 23-54.
72. Op. cit., p. 33.

his conclusions is, however, highly reasonable and supported by the twelfth introductory verse of the *Śaivasarvasvasāra*, one of the Smṛti works of Vidyāpati. It is to the effect that 'the title of the work (i.e. *Śaivasarvasvasāra*) is most probably *Śambhuvākyāvalī* as given in the 12th verse[73] and not *Śaivasarvasvasāra* as given in the 11th.[74] Compare the titles *Gaṅgāvākyavalī* and *Dānavākyāvalī*. The work is compared to a wish-granting creeper in the last verse, which gives the name of the work as *Śambhoḥ vākyāvalī*.'[75] Though Chatterji's paper on Vidyāpati is highly reasonable, informing and accurate, yet one or two minor errors have crept into it. For example, he says on p. 32 that 'the *Dānavākyāvalī* is attributed to Dhīravatī, the elder queen of Narasiṃhadeva.' The name of the elder queen of Narasiṃhadeva, to whom the *Dānavākyāvalī* is attributed, was not Dhīravatī' but Dhīramati.[76]

Though Dr. Kane has utilized the Deccan College MS. (No. 368 of 1891-95) of the *Dānavākyāvalī* in the chapter on *dāna* in his second volume (1941), yet he has devoted no separate section to Vidyāpati in his first volume (1930). He has not, however altogether omitted Vidyāpati from treatment in this volume but has collected all possible facts relating to his works and personal history in nearly a full column on pp. 739-40 (Appendix B) of the same. He has also added short notes on the six Smṛti works of Vidyāpati on pp. 538, 561,[77] 564, 618, 621 and 642 respectively in Appendix A of the same work. Form the above seven notes in the two Appendices we can gather that 'Vidyāpati flourished between 1375 and 1450 A.D., was a voluminous and versatile writer, wrote in Maithili also and on moral tales (as in *Puruṣaparīkṣā*, *Bhūparikramaṇa*) and composed the following six works on Dharmaśāstra, viz. *Gaṅgāvākyāvali*, *Dānavākyāvalī*, *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī*, *Varṣakṛtya*, *Vibhāgasāra* and *Śaivasarvasvasāra*. His *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* is mentioned by Govindānanda and Raghunandana (in *Prāyaścittatattva*). His *Durgābhaktitaraṅginī* mentioned *Ratnakara* and was his last work. His *Varṣakṛtya* is mentioned in the *Malamāsatattva* of Raghunandana and he is mentioned in the Kṛtyatattvārṇava of Srīnātha.' Dr. Kane says in his entry against the *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī* (p. 564) that it has been printed in Calcutta in 1909. The *Śaivasarvasvasāra* was, however, published from Darbhanga in 1897. Since the publication of Dr. Kane's first volume in 1930, only the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* of the remaining four Smṛti works of Vidyāpati has been critically edited and published by the late Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri from Calcutta in 1940. The *Puruṣaparīkṣā* was published earlier in 1888-89 from Darbhanga and in 1927-28 from Bombay. The

73. pramāṇamūlā navapallavāḍhyā sapuṣpikā ramyaphalopapannā /
abhīṣṭasiddhyartham vibudhair upeyā *vākyāvalī* kalpalateva *Śambhoḥ* //
74. vijñā'nujñāpya vidyāpati-kṛtinam asau viśva-vikhyātakīrtiḥ /
śrīmad-viśvāsadevī viracayati śivaṃ śaivasarvasvasāram //
75. p. 31a (footnote), Chatterji's paper on Vidyāpati.
76. Vide colophon of the D.C. MS. (No. 368 of 1891-95) of the *Dānavākyāvalī*, which reads° Śrī-dha (dhī ?) ramati-viracitā(dā-) navākyāvalī sampūrṇā /
77. The 71st forme (pp. 561-568) of this volume has been wrongly paginated as pp. 559-566 and so pp. 559 and 562 are really pp. 561 and 564 respectively.

printed edition of the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* contains reference[78] to another printed edition of the Durgābhakti° from Sylhet in 1934. But the present writer has not been able to secure a copy of either the Calcutta or Sylhet edition but has consulted a copy of the Darbhanga edition of 1900-1901 of the same.

The Gaṅgāvākyāvalī has been published along with the Dvārakā-pattala of a lady, Bīnabāyī by name, in a single volume with very confusing pagination, as on account of the continuous numbering of the pages with the latter work the former begins from p. 43 and the introduction and the text run up to p. 314, while the appendices and indexes consist of 136 and 55 pages respectively, with separate paginations, and at the end of the volume there is a joint list of abbreviations, a general index etc. of the two works, covering 43 pages with another separate pagination. There are also joint dedication, foreword, preface and contents of the two works in the beginning of the volume, covering 12 pages, marked with Roman numerals. The reason for the joint publication of the two unconnected works by separate authors is that they form in a single bound volume, vols. III and IV of the author's series entitled "*The contribution of women to Sanskrit Literature*', as, according to the editor, the Gaṅgāvākyāvalī like the Dvārakā-pattala is also the production of a woman, the queen Viśvāsadevī of Mithilā and not Vidyāpati, the contemporary poet and scholar of the same place. So we find that the printed edition[79] of the G.V. consists of 506 pages and the text portion alone covers 208 pages. Though the present edition of the G. V., which is a work on dharmaśāstra, was published just a decade after the publication of Dr. Kane's epoch-making *History of Dharmaśastra*, Vol. I, yet the learned editor has nowhere mentioned Dr. Kane's great work in his bulky volume, consisting of 506 pages in the G.V. portion alone. Curiously enough, the same scholar, who has critically edited for the first time the Gaṅgāvākyāvalī of Vidyāpati and must have, therefore, consulted the learned papers on the same author by Chakravarti and Chatterji, has also nowhere mentioned the names of those pioneer scholars, who have tried to dispel the cloud of obscurity hanging over Vidyāpati and his works. The Introduction of the printed edition of the G.V. covers 64 pages and is nothing but a synopsis of the entire work, while the six appendices consist of the following six topics :

(1) Further references, variant readings and notes.
(2) Some remarks on the quotations in the Gaṅgāvākyāvalī.
(3) Description of the MSS. of the Gaṅāvākyāvalī.
(4) Some remarks on the authorship of the Gaṅgāvākyāvalī.
(5) The royal family of Mithilā.
(6) Some well-known *Smārtas* who have quoted the Gaṅgāvākyāvalī : Mitra Miśra, Raghunandana and Vācaspati Miśra.

78. Vide p. 119, footnote (Appendix portion).

79. Based on three MSS., two belonging to the Asiatic Society (Calcutta) and the third to the India office (London).

The exhaustive Introduction and the copious Appendices and indexes have made this edition of the G. V. highly useful. But though the learned editor has mostly identified the quotations in the G. V. in the original works, cited parallel quotations from other digests including those of the great Bengal digest-writer Raghunandana, described him and his works and reproduced some ten quotations from the G. V. in several works of the same digest-writer, yet he has nowhere identified these quotations in the printed edition of the G.V., which circumstance would have really testified to the great merit and popularity' of the work.

Before proceeding to trace the quotations from the G.V. in several works of Govindānanda and Raghunandana, it will not be out of place here to give a short account of the literary life of Vidyāpati and discuss the authorship of the G. V., which is ascribed by Dr. Chaudhuri to the patron queen Viśvāsadevī of Mithilā and to Vidyāpati.

Vidyāpati adorned the courts of as many as nine rulers of Mithilā, viz. Kīrtisiṃha, Bhavasiṃha, Devasiṃha, Śivasiṃha, Padmasiṃha. Viśvāsadevī, Harasiṃha, Narasiṃha and Dhīrasiṃha, as will be evident from the following facts :

(1) The *Kīrtilatā* was composed by Vidyāpati during the reign of Kīrtisiṃha to commemorate his victory over Aslan.[80]

(2) Vidyāpati refers to Bhavasiṃha as king in verse 1 of the *Śaivasarvasvasāra* and eulogises Devasiṃha in verse 2 of the same and also in verse 1 of the *Puruṣaparikṣā*. The *Bhūparikramaṇa* of Vidyāpati was composed at the instance of the latter king.[81]

(3) Vidyāpati frequently refers in his Padāvalī[82] to Rūpanārāyaṇa, another name Sivasiṃha and to his wives, Lakhimā Devī, Sukhmā Devī, Madhumatī Devī etc.

(4) Vidyāpati refers in verses 5 and 6 of his *Śaivasarvasvasāra* to the succession of Padmasiṃha to the throne of Mithilā after his brother Śivasiṃha.

(5) Vidyāpati says in verses 8 and 12 of the same work that Viśvāsadevī was the wife of Padmasiṃha and ruled Mithilā with great suceess, was a devotee of Śiva and ordered Vidyāpati to compose a work on Śiva called *Śaivasarvasvasāra*.

(6) The *Vibhāgasāra*[83] of Vidyāpati refers to the name of Harisiṃha, which was another name of Harasiṃha.

(7) The *Dānavākyāvalī*[84] and *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī* (v. 3) of Vidyāpati refer to Narasiṃha or Nṛsiṃha, *alias* Darpanārāyaṇa.

---

80. Vide p. 2 of the Kīrtilatā, ed. by Mm. Haraprasad Shastri, Calcutta, 1924-25.
81. Vide verses 2 and 3, MS. No. 79, Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. at the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, Vol. IV.
82. *Vidyāpatir Padāvalī*, ed. by Nagendranath Gupta, Calcutta (1909-10), *pada* 21, p. 15 —*rūpanārāyaṇai rasa jānathi śivasiṃha mithilā bhūpe* / See also the land-grant, Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIV, p. 190, 2nd column and *Vidyāpatir Padāvalī*, Nos. 52, 186 and 467.
83. rājño bhaveśād-dharisiṃha āsīt-tat-sūnunā darpanārāyaṇena /
rājñā niyukto' tra vibhāgasāraṃ vicārya vidyāpatirātanoti //
[MS. No. 329, Descriptive Catalogue of (Sanskrit) MSS. in Mithilā, Vol. I (Smṛti)].
84. Op. cit., MS. No. 192.

(8) The *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī* (v. 6) of Vidyāpati was composed at the instance of Dhīrasiṃha, also known as Rūpanārāyaṇa.

Dr. Chaudhuri says that the fact of Vidyāpati's adorning the courts of as many as eight[85] rulers of Mithilā 'is indeed unique in the history of the world ; this, however, became possible as many of them reigned only for short periods.'[86]

As Vidyāpati's first work, the *Kīrtilatā*, was composed just after his first patron king, Kīrtisiṃha, ascended the throne of Mithilā after the assassination of Gaṇeśvara by Aslan in 1367-68 A.D., so it seems to have been composed in c. 1370 A.D., when Vidyāpati must have been at least twenty years old. Again as Śrīnivāsa's *Setudarpaṇī* was composed about 1438 A.D.[87] at tha instance of Dhīrasiṃha, the last royal patron of Vidyāpati, who must have been nearly ninety years old by that time, so we see that the period c. 1370-c. 1440 A.D., assigned by Dr. Chaudhuri to Vidyāpati's literary activity, compares favourably with that assigned by Dr. Kane to the same, viz. 1375-1450 A.D. Vidyāpati was the grandson of Jayadatta, who was the son of Dhīreśvara, uncle of Caṇḍeśvara, the great Mithilā digest-writer of the 14th century. So it is very likely that Vidyāpati who was later than Caṇḍeśvara (1310-1360 A.D.) by two generations, must have flourished by the time assigned by Drs. Kane and Chaudhuri and not by that assigned either by Chakravarti or by Chatterji, referred to above. Though the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* is one of the three published dharmaśāstra works of Vidyāpati and one of his best and most authoritative works, being quoted thrice by Govindānanda and about twenty times by Raghunandana,[88] yet the second introductory verse in all MSS. and the colophon in almost all MSS. of the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* ascribe the authorship of the work not to Vidyāpati but to his patron queen Viśvāsadevī. The colophons in only two MSS.[89] of the G.V. ascribe

---

85. Not eight but nine. Dr. Chaudhuri inadvertently omits Bhavasiṃha from his final enumeration, though he describes his career at great length on pp. 112-13 (App. portion).
86. Op. cit., p. 120 (App. portion).
87. Though Dr. Chaudhuri says under the heading 'Dhīrasiṃha' on p. 120 (App. portion) that 'In 321 of the Lakṣmaṇa era i.e. 1438 A.D. the commentary *Setudarpaṇī* of Śrīnivāsa on the *Setubandha* was copied at his instance', yet he says on p. 123 (App. portion) that 'The date of Dhīrasiṃha, the last royal patron of Vidyāpati, is also known ; at his instance Śrīnivāsa's *Setudarpaṇī* was composed about 1430 A.D.'
88. Raghunandana has also quoted the *Dānavākyāvalī* only once in the *Udvāhatattva*, the *Varṣakṛtya* thrice in the *Malamāsa*°, only once in the *Durgotsava*° and once in the *Ekādaśī*° and the *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī* seven times in his *Durgotsava.*° Vide p. 138, Jīvānanda's edn. of *Smṛtitattva*, Vol. II for the quotation in the *Udvāhatattva* and footnote 171 below for those in the *Malamāsatattva*.
89. Vide Descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. at the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, vol. II, p. 501 and Mitra's Notices of Sanskrit MSS., vol. III, p. 234 f., no. 1251.

the work to Vidyāpati. But the following concluding verse occurs in every MS. of the same :

kiyan-nibandham ālokya śrī-vidyāpati-sūriṇā /
gaṅgāvākyāvalī devyāḥ pramāṇair vimalīkṛtā //

The purport of the verse is that 'the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* of the queen (Viśvāsadevī) has been rendered lucid by the scholar Vidyāpati with authoritative statements after consultation of some *nibandha*.' All previous Sanskrit scholars have attributed the authorship of the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* to Vidyāpati and the late Manmohan Chakravarti has drawn pointed attention to 'one characteristic feature of Vidyāpati's works that they were written under the patronage of one or other member of the royal family of Kāmeśvara ; and that in some instances the works were even attributed to them.'[90] But Dr. Chaudhuri ascribes it to Viśvāsadevī on the strengh of the second introductory verse and colophon and explains away the concluding verse, quoted avove by interpreting it to mean that 'Vidyāpati rendered the help (to Viśvāsadevī) in course of revision of the work' and adds, 'So it is certain that Viśvāsadevī would not have been able to compose the work, if she were not sure of the materials at her disposal.'[91] Dr. Chaudhuri quotes on p. 107 (footnote 2) (App. portion) three references to the author of the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* as *gaṅgāvākyāvalīkāra* by Govindānanda in two of his works viz. *Varṣakriyākaumudī* and *Śuddhikaumudī*. Though the Sanskrit word *gaṅgāvākyāvalīkāra* is masculine and hence denotes a male author, which may mean Vidyāpati, yet Dr. Chaudhuri explains the word away by saying that it is used in a general sense and that the gender is not designated. Though he admits Vidyāpati to be a great poet, scholar and helper of Viśvāsadevī in her composing the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī*, yet he says that 'it does not necessarily follow that Viśvāsadevī could not have beed so learned as to compose the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī*.'[92] He then adduces evidence to show that the royal family of Mithilā including the ladies was very learned ; and that Viśvāsadevī's sister-in-law Lakhimādevī, too, was a poetess of repute. The present writer appends below the following reasons for establishing the authorship of Vidyāpati of the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* :

(1) Not only the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* but also the *Dānavākyāvalī*, the *Śambhuvakyāvalī* (which is the real name of the work *Śaivasarvasvasāra*, as seen above) and the *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī*[93] are attributed to royal patrons, Dhīramatidevī, *Viśvāsadevī* and Dhīrasiṃha respectively.

(2) The concluding verse of the *Dānavākyāvalī*[94] is almost identical with that of

90. J. A. S. B., Vol. XI (1915), p. 391.
91. Vide p. 106 (Appendix portion), G.V.
92. Vide p. 107 (op. cit.).
93. V. 6.
94. nibandhān samyag-ālokya śrī-vidyāpatisūriṇā /
dānavākyāvalī devyāḥ pramāṇair-vimalīkṛtā //

the *Gaṅgāvākyāvalī* and both these verses implicity state that neither Dhīramatidevī nor Viśvāsadevī but Vidyāpati is the real author of both the works.

(3) The eleventh verse[95] of the *Śambhuvākyāvalī* is also similar in import to the above two concluding verses and explicity makes Viśvāsadevī and not Vidyāpati the author of the work, though it implicity ascribes the authorship to the latter.

(4) The *Madanapārijāta*, *Mahārṇava*, *Tithinirṇayasāra* and *Smṛtikaumudī*, four other digests, though ostensibly the works of the king Madanapāla and his son, Mandhātā, were really composed by their protegee, Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa.[96]

Vide the Appendix (H) for the quotations.

IV. Vācaspati Miśra (1425-1480 A.D.)

The *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*

The late Mm. Dr. Haraprasad Shastri in his Preface to the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS., Vol. III, Smṛti (published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1925) has devoted some pages to *tīrthas* or places of pilgrimage and has described in the body of the Catalogue Smṛti MSS., (including those on *tīrthas*) of the Government of India collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Though a full MS. of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* of Vācaspati Miśra and a partial one are of the same, dealing with *Gayāprakāśa*, belonging to this collection, has been described by the Shastri in the body of the Catalogue and though the *Tirthacintāmaṇi* was critically edited[97] in 1912 by the late Mm. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, yet the Shastri has not taken even a passing notice either of the MSS. or of the printed edition in his elaborate Preface. This Tīrthacintāmaṇi is an important work in dharmaśāstra literature for the following three reasons, viz. (1) it is one of the few published works, which deal exclusively with *tīrtha*, (2) it is from the pen of the fifteenth century *nibandhakāra* Vācaspati Miśra of Mithilā, whose other works on dharmaśāstra are still of paramount authority in that region and (3) the great Bengal *nibandhakāra* Raghunandana of the 16th century, who was posterior to Vācaspati by nearly a century, has quoted from it a number of times, thus proving its great influence over the Bengal School also. So we propose to discuss its contents in brief.

Though the rites and ceremonies in Prayāga, Puruṣottama, Gaṅgā, Gayā and

---

95. Vide footnote 74 above.
96. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I, pp. 381-4.
97. On the basis of four MSS., one obtained from the Asiatic Society (Calcutta), the other from the Sanskrit College (Calcutta), the third from a private library of Bhatpara (West Bengal) and the fourth from the Sanskrit College (Benares).

Vārāṇasī[98] are the main subject-matter of the work which is divided into five corresponding *prakāśas* (or sections), yet some twenty-five other places of pilgrimage have also been touched upon and the rites peculiar to them described. The most important of these subsidiary places of pilgrimage are Vindusaras (pp. 176-80), Koṇārka (pp. 180-82), Rāmeśvara (p. 182), Kaṇakhala (p. 217), Nīlaparvata (p. 217) and Saptagrāma (p. 219).

The Vindusaras is a holy lake and a plunge into it has been recommended by our author in his description of the rites of the *Kṛttivāsas Kṣetra.* It is evident from the first five lines[99] of p. 176 that this holy lake is situated in Orissa near the modern capital city of Bhuvaneśvara. The purport of these lines is that the great god, who wears tiger's skin (*Kṛttiʌāsā maheśvaraḥ,* i.e. Śiva), resides in the country of Utkala (modern Orissa) and his place of residence (*kṣetra*) is extremely unattainable and removes (if attained) all kinds of sins ; that this place is filled with innumerable phallic emblems and is as holy as Vārāṇasī, is famous as *Ekāmraka* and consists of eight holy places, including the place of pilgrimage of Vindusaras. The Koṇārka is nothing but the present Konarak, also in Orissa, as appears from its first descriptive verse[100] (p. 180). But the Rāmeśvara of our author does not seem to be the present Rāmeśvaram in the extreme south of India near the Cape Comorin but was probably at the time of our author a holy place, situated within the territorial limits of the greater Koṇārka, as is definitely proved ay the first[101] of the six verses (p. 182), specially devoted to it but included with the *Kaṇārka-vidhi* (i.e. the rites relating to Koṇārka). Saptagrāma on the Gaṅgā was a flourishing city in the 15th century, being situated near modern Ādisaptagrāma and Triveṇī in the Hooghly district of West Bengal. It has been called by our author *Dakṣlṇāprayāga* and explained by him as *Muktaveṇī* and *Saptagrāma,* inasmuch as like Prayāga (modern Allahabad),

---

98. This selection of only five places of pilgrimage by our author seems to be guided by the following statement of the *Vāyupurāṇa* (II. 45. 50b-51b) :

Let Vārāṇasī, Prayāga, Puruṣottama and the confluence of the Gaṅgā with the sea remain for ever. The place on the Phalgu (i.e. Gayā), presided over by Gadādhara, is the best of all places of pilgrimage.

99. Tathā hi Brahmapurāṇe :

tathā caivotkaladeśe kṛttivāsā maheśvaraḥ /
sarva-pāpa-haraṃ tasya kṣetraṃ parama-durlabham //
liṅga-koṭi-somāyuktaṃ vāraṇasyāḥ samaṃ śubham /
ekāmraketi vikhyātaṃ tīrthāṣṭaka-samanvitam //
tīrthaṃ *vindusaro* nāma tasmin kṣetre dvijottamāḥ /

100. Tathā hi—
etanmayā muniśreṣṭhāḥ kṣetraṃ proktaṃ sudurlabham /
koṇārkasyodadhes-tīraṃ bhukti-mukti-phalapradaṁ //

101. koṇārka-kṣetram adhikṛtya—
āste tatra mahādevaḥ tīre nada-nadīpateḥ /
rāmeśvara iti khyātaḥ sarvakāma-phalapradaḥ //

it was also the confluence of three rivers, viz. Gaṅgā, Yamunā and Sarasvatī. Our author says on the authority of the *Mahābhārata*[102] that the Yamunā has separated here from the Gaṅgā and so a bath in this place in the river confers the same religious merit on the performer as in Prayāga. Thus according to our author the braids of hairs of the three rivers, united at the latter place, have been, as it were, loosened here, which circumstance has given it the appellation of *muktaveṇī* (lit. loosened braids).

Before taking up the specific description of the sacred places of pilgrimage, our author devotes some 17 pages to the *sāmānyavidhi* or general remarks. These include his own viewpoints regarding pilgrimages in general, the proper time and preliminaries and contain topics of transport, religious fervour and culture, as they existed in Eastern India in the 15th century at the close of the Pathan regime.[103]

Vācaspati Miśra says on the authority of the *Mahābhārata* that pilgrimages are prescribed for the poorer sections of the community, as unlike sacrifices they can be easily performed by the poor, the helpless and the single persons. But the intending pilgrim should exercise control over the hands, feet and mind and should possess knowledge, austerity and fame. Control over hands is needed for restraining oneself from stealing, that over feet for preventing him from visiting forbidden countries and knowledge is required to know beforehand the merits of the respective places of pilgrimage. Austerity consists in residence and fasting in those places and fame is the public renown of the pilgrim as a good man, because it is the good men who reap the fruits of their knowledge. Though positive good does not accrue to the bad persons, their sins also vanish by visits to places of pilgrimage. An intending pilgrim should not only control his senses but also be physically fit to withstand the rigours of the journey and the climate. Three days before his departure he should take one meal in the whole twenty-four hours, shave his head and fast on the next day and worship the god *Gaṇeśa* and offer oblations of ghee to the gods and *manes* on the next following day. He should pass the night of this third day in the next village, situated within a *krośa* (i.e. two miles) and start on his contemplated journey the next morning.

The author then quotes three verses from the *Matsyapurāṇa* to the effect that journey to a holy place, if accomplished in a conveyance, specially in one drawn by bullocks, is rendered fruitless. But he explains the verses away by saying that the above prohibition of conveyances holds good only in the case of a pilgrimage to Prayāga. The reason is obvious. The distances of Gayā (in South Bihar), Puruṣottama (or modern

102. tad-dakṣiṇaprayāgaṣtu gaṅgāto yamunā gatā /
snānāt-tatrākṣayaṃ puṇyaṃ prayāga iva labhyate //
dakṣiṇa-prayāstu mukta-veṇī saptagrāma iti prasiddhaḥ /

103. Vide the sub-section "The Tīrthakāṇḍa" I (d) above for a comparison of the contents of this work with those of the former work.

Puri in Orissa), the Gaṅgā (which flows by the southern extremity of Mithilā or North Bihar) and Vārāṇasī (in the Uttara Pradeśa) from our author's place of residence in Mithilā were too considerable to be reached on foot, but the way between Vārāṇasī and Prayāga (modern Allahabad) did not offer such an insurmountable difficulty to the pedestrian pilgrim, as both the above places are situated in the modern Uttara Pradeśa at a distance of one hundred miles only.

The author then says that walking bare-footed conduces to four times the religious merit, occurring from the visit to a place of pilgrimage. But putting on shoes is also not condemned, as he says on the authority of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* that a person, who wishes to protect his own self, should use the umbrella in summer and rains, the staff at night and in forest and should always go about by covering his feet with shoes. His next remark is to the effect that a person, going to a place of pilgrimage with the financial assistance of another person, gains one-sixteenth part only of the religious merit and one, primarily bound for a separate place but incidentally reaching a holy place *en route*, gets half of the merit after the performance of bathing and other religious ceremonies.

Vide Appendix (pp. 203-4) of the present writer's monograph on '*Raghunandana's indebtedness* etc.' for the quotations from the T.C. in several works of that author.

V. Govindânanda Kavikaṅkaṇācârya (1510-1550 A.D.)

(a) His date, place of residence, social pedigree and his hitherto-unknown fifth digest, the *Kriyākaumudī*

(I) Date and the fifth digest

Govindânanda Kavikaṅkaṇācārya, who was a senior contemporary[104] of the great Bengali *nibandhakāra*, Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya, was known to Sanskrit scholars up to the end of the last century as the commentator on the *Prāyaścittaviveka* of Śūlapāṇi, a fourteenth century predecessor of the same province. Diligent students of the *Tithitattva* of Raghunandana found, however, references to Govindânanda and quotations from his *Varṣa-kriyā-kaumudī* (V.K.K.) in the commentary of the same work by the Bengali, Kâśirâma Vâcaspati of the 18th century. It is due to the discovery and subsequent publication in the *Bibliotheca Indica* of the four digests of Govindânanda, to be described below, between 1900 and 1905 by the late Mm. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha that his name was prominently brought to the notice of Sanskrit scholars. His date has been finally settled by the editor in the preface to his edition of the V.K.K. on the strength of the concluding verse of the *Jyotiṣmatī*,[105] an unpublished astronomical work by the author's father, Gaṇapati Bhaṭṭa and corroborated by the editor later in the preface to his edition of the *Śuddhikaumudī*, another work by the same author, on the strength of several *śaka* years[106] with intercalary months, recorded in it. But the late Rai Bahadur Manmohan Chakravarti overlooked both the above pieces of evidence in his previously mentioned paper viz. '*Contributions to the History of Smṛti in Bengal and Mithilā*' (1915) and Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane has lost sight of the first piece of evidence in the first volume of his

---

104. Raghunandana flourished in Navadvīpa in the Nadia district, while Govindānanda lived in Bagri in the Midnapore district, both in Bengal, the two scholars being separated by almost a generation only (vide Kane, *History of Dharmaśâstra*, vol. I, 415 and 419, vide also pp. II-III of the preface to V.K.K.).

105. Viśvâṅga-śruti-sammite Kaliyugasyābde prasiddhāhvayo bhaṭṭaḥ khyâta-guṇottaro gaṇapatir-jyotirvidâm-agraṇīḥ / lakṣmi-nandi-purandarânuja-padadvandvâravindârpitasvântaḥ santatam-indirā-parigato jyotiṣmatīmâtanot //, which means that Gaṇapati, the foremost of the astronomers, composed that work in the Kali year 4613 (=1512 A.D.) in his mature age.

106. All the *śaka* years, mentioned by our author in connection with intercalary months between pp. 266 and 270 in his *Śuddhikaumudī*, are given below in chronological order : 1397, 1414, 1416, 1419, 1422, 1424, 1443, 1449, 1452, 1454 and 1457.

History (1930). It may also be added that the examination by the author of the several intercalary months in his *Śuddhikaumudī* (pp. 266-270) has been mentioned by both the editor, Mm. Smṛtitīrtha and Dr. Kane, the former in the preface to the *Śuddhikaumudī*, as stated above and the latter in his section on Govindānanda (op. cit.). But both of them are a bit inaccurate. The editor's statement, viz. 'In this treatise (i.e. *Śuddhikaumudī*) the author has examined every '*Malamāsa*' or intercalary month from *śaka* 1400-1457, corresponding to 1478 to 1535 A.D.' loses sight of the *śaka* 1397, which has also been mentioned in this connection by the author on p. 268 of the above work. Dr. Kane's statement (loc. cit.), viz. 'His *Śuddhikaumudī* examines intercalary months from *śāke* 1414 to *śāke* 1457 (i.e. from 1492 A.D. to 1535 A.D.)' and his quotation from p. 266 only in the corresponding footnote no. 1016, combined with his remark just following it, viz. 'vide p. 270 for intercalary month in śāke 1449 and 1457', ignore the connected matter on p. 268, in which the author has examined the intercalary months of the *śaka* years 1424, 1397 and 1443. The editor established the author's date as between 1510 and 1540 A.D. from the mention of the Kali year 4613 (=1512 A.D.) as the year of composition of the *Jyotiṣmatī* by the author's father in his mature age and added after his previously quoted statement in the preface to the *Śuddhikaumudī*, 'This (i.e. 1478 to 1535 A.D.) appears to be the period of the author's literary activity and it corroborates the debt of the author as arrived at in the preface to the *Varṣakrīyākaumudī*.' This is also somewhat inaccurate, as it is in conflict with the date of the author, viz. between 1510 and 1540 A.D., as settled by the editor in the abovementioned preface and also because sixty years (or fiftyseven years according to the editor's inaccurate enumeration) between 1475 and 1535 A.D. is too long a time to be the flourishing period of *one single* author and may possibly be the combined periods of literary activity of both the author's father and the author himself. It should be remembered in this connection that the author's father, who composed the *Jyotiṣmatī*, a treatise on Astronomy, was an astronomer and was thus in a position to record the specific years with intercalary months from so early a date as *śaka* 1397 (i.e. 1475 A.D.), which our author has fully utilized in his *Śuddhikaumudī*. So the following statement of Dr. Kane, just after the one quoted above, seems to be justified, viz. 'Therefore it appears that he wrote his *Śuddhikaumudī* immediately after *śāke* 1457 (i.e. 1535 A.D.). He wrote the *Śrāddhakaumudī* and *Varṣakriyākaumudī* after the *Śuddhikaumudī*. Therefore we shall be very near the truth if his literary activity be placed between 1500 and 1540 A.D.' As the *Dānakriyākaumudī* quotes no other work of the same author and the *Śuddhikaumudī* cites it alone, so the exact sequence of the composition of the four works of Govindānanda is as follows :

Dānakriyākaumudī, *Śuddhikaumudī* (quoting the *Dāna*° on p. 160), *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī* (quoting the Dāna° on pp. 34 and 529 and the *Śuddhi*° on pp. 323, 342, 440 and 483) and *Varṣakriyākaumudī* (quoting the *Śuddhi*° on pp. 236 and 359 and the *Srāddh*° on pp. 352 and 487). This sequence fully agrees with that, given by Dr. Kane on p. 414 in his section on Govindānanda, while enumerating the works of the latter. The exact period of the time of composition of the above four works can be corrected and further

narrowed down as between 1530 and 1550 A.D. on the strength of the above sequence, coupled with the probable facts that the second work, viz. the *Śuddhi°*, was composed just after 1535 A.D. and that the first work, viz. the *Dāna°*, was produced within the five years, just preceding that date and that the third and fourth works, viz. *Śrāddha°* and *Varṣa°*, were completed within the fifteen years, just following the above date. We append below the extents of the above four works in support of the probability of our assumption :

Dāna° (206 pages), *Śuddhi°* (360 pages), *Srāddha°* (560 pages) and *Varṣa°* (579 pages). But as our author also wrote the *Kriyākaumudī*, a hitherto-unknown fifth digest, a commentary on the *Prāyaścittaviveka* of *Śūlapāṇi* and several other commentaries, so the period of his literary activity seems to be between 1510 and 1550 A.D.[107]

The editor, Mm. Smṛtitīrtha, says on p. II of his preface to the V.K.K., '*Varṣakṛtya* has been quoted by Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya in his *Malamāsatattva* (in the *cāturmāsya-vrata-prakaraṇa*) and *Kriyākaumudī* in the *Āhnikatattva* (*snāna-prakaraṇa*)' and also says on p. I of the same preface, 'His other works of the same series are *Kriyākaumudī*, *Dānakaumudi*, *Śrāddhakaumudi* and *Śuddhikaumudi* ; all these, excepting *Kriyākaumudī*, of which there is only one incomplete copy available in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, are now being collected and edited by me under the patronage of the aforesaid Society.' The first part of the first statement of the editor is wrong, as the *Varṣakṛtya* is not identical with the *Varṣakriyākaumudī* but is a different work by Vidyāpati, having been quoted thrice in the *Malamāsatattva* (pp. 775, 822 and 823), the first two with the word '*Varṣakṛtye*' and the last with the phrase '*Vidyāpatikṛta-Varṣakṛtye.*' The second part of the first statement is absolutely correct, as Raghunandana has quoted the *Kriyākaumudī* on pp. 343 and 344 and the *Kaumudī* on p. 376 of his *Āhnikatattva* and these quotations have recently been traced by Śrīmatī Vāṇī Cakravarti in her Bengali monograph viz. *Samāja-saṃskāraka Raghunandana* (published from Calcutta, July, 1964) in the solitary Asiatic Society MS. of the same work, referred to by the editor in the second statement. She has also shown that Govindānanda's reference to it in his *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī* (p. 559), viz. '*prayogastu kriyākaumudyāṃ draṣṭavyaḥ*', which means that 'the procedure in question should be looked for in the *Kriyākaumudī*', is also in connection with the author's own work of the same name. The priority of Govindānanda to Raghunandana, who flourished about 1560 A.D., which was proved by the editor from other sources, is now definitely confirmed by Śrīmatī Cakravarti's above identification of Raghunandana's quotations in the MS. of the *Kriyākaumudī*. The late Rai Bahadur Chakravarti rightly resented the above wrong equation of the *Varṣakṛtya* with the *Varṣakriyākaumudī* by the editor but Dr. Kane has inadvertently accepted it, as is evident from his following sentence (loc. cit.) viz. 'He (i.e. Govindānanda) is quoted by Raghu-

107. This is in correction of the present writer's carelessly affixing Govindānanda's date as 1510-1540 A.D. and 1520-1550 A.D. on pp. 13 and 23 respeetively of his '*Studies in Dharmaśāstra*' I. (Ancient Period).

nandana in his *Malamāsatattva* and *Āhnikatattva*.' The second part of the above statement of Dr. Kane, viz. 'Raghunandana's quoting Govindānanda in his *Āhnikatattva*' is, however, right, as will be apparent from the foregoing discussion.

(II) Residence and pedigree

The editor, Mm. Smṛtitīrtha, clearly stated in his prefaces of the first two works of Govindānanda, viz. the *Varṣa*° (p. II) and *Dāna*° that the author was a resident of the village Bagri in the district of Midnapore and belonged to the *Pāścātya Vaidika* (i.e. *Vaidika* from the west) class of Bengali Brāhmaṇas. But curiously enough, the late Mm. Dr. Haraprasad Shastri in the preface (pp. xxi and lvii) to his Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS., vol. iii, Smṛti, (published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1925) has made the following two inaccurate statements about Govindānanda due to oversight :

(a) The end of the 15th century was also the time when a leader of the foreign Brahmins settled in the outskirts of Bengal, in the district of Bankura, wrote a code for the Brahmins of his own persuasion (sic.), entitled *Varṣa-kriyā-kaumudī*, complete in six books. It is being still used by the foreign Brahmins of the district and printed in the Bibl. Ind. Series.

(b) Govindānanda Kavikaṅkaṇācārya was a Drāviḍa Brāhmaṇa settled in the district of Bankura in Bengal. He wrote a comprehensive work entitled *Kriyākaumudī* of which *Dānā-kriyā* and *Varṣa-kriyā* are represented in nos. 2691 and 2692.

The above two statements mean practically the same thing, the only two further inaccuracies in the former being that (1) the code is 'entitled *Varṣa-kriyā-kaumudī*' and that (2) it is 'complete in six books,' and the only additional incorrectness in the latter being that Govindānanda's comprehensive work is entitled *Kriyā-kaumudī*.' The fact is that one of the books (and not the entire code) is entitled '*Varṣa-kriyā-kaumudī*', that it is complete in five books (and not in six) and that the comprehensive work, i.e. the code, is not 'entitled *Kriyā-kaumudī*', which latter, as we have seen above, is the name of the hitherto-unknown fifth digest of our author.

The above-mentioned careless conversion by the late Mm. Dr. Shastri of the Midnapore district into Bankura is due to the fact that Bagri, the residential village of Govindānanda, is situated in the northern most part of Midnapore district, contiguous to the adjacent district of Bankura. Again, the above substitution by that scholar of *Pāścātya Vaidika* Brāhmaṇas, to which class our author belonged, by Drāviḍa or foreign Brāhmaṇas has been probably occasioned by the later advent of the *Pāścātya Vaidika* Brāhmaṇas from Kanauj in the Uttara Pradeśa to West Bengal than the *Rāḍhīya* Brāhmaṇas, to which sect the great Bengali digest-writer, Raghunandana and the late Shastri belonged. The *Pāścātya Vaidika* Brāhmaṇas began migrating to West Bengal from the end of the 15th

century, if Govindānanda's father, Gaṇapati Bhaṭṭa, is considered to be the first immigrant, while they were brought earlier to East Bengal by the king Sāmalavarmā in the 11th century (1079 A.D.).[108]

The above inaccurate statements of the late Shastri have led many scholars to doubt the findings of the editor, regarding the place of residence and social pedigree of our author. For example, Dr. R. C. Hazra[109] has reopened the questions and expressed doubts about the authenticity of the editor's statements. So the present writer has been compelled to re-emphasize those statements and add in this connection the following facts.

The late Pandit Haran Chandra Tarkavagīśa, who supplied the editor with the decisive concluding verse of the *Jyotiṣmatī*, was a direct descendant of Govindānanda and a cognatic relation of the editor, who was descended from Nārāyaṇa Ṭhakkura, another *Pāścātya Vaidika* Brāhmaṇa from Kanouj and the author of the *Brahmasaṃskāramañjarī*. Haran Chandra's agnates, who are also descended from our author, still live in that village, which is only four miles off Garbeta station on the South-Eastern Railway, 109 miles distant from Calcutta. One of the descendants of Govindānanda, the late Adityram Bhattacharya, migrated to the present writer's residential town, Bhatpara and his surviving sons still live here as next-door neighbours of the present writer.

Dr. S. C. Banerji has made the following erroneous remark on p. 20 of his Bengali work viz. *Smṛtiśāstre Bāṅgālī*[110] (i.e. the Bengalis as the producers of Smṛti literature):

"Some scholars conclude from the mention of the *Kriyākaumudī* by Raghunandana in his *Āhnikatattva* (*Smṛtitattva*, vol. I., p. 343) that Govindānanda was anterior to Raghunandana. According to their view the *Varṣakriyākaumudī* is only a part of Govindānanda's bigger work '*Kriyākaumudī*'. But there is no proof of that opinion. It is true that Govindānanda himself has referred to the *Kriyākaumudī* (p. 559 of the *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī*) but he has not definitely said that it was his own composition." The misconception of Dr. Banerji regarding the authorship of the *Kriyākaumudī* has been already refuted by the present writer, who wishes to point out in conclusion that the editor, being misled by the names of the first three works, viz. *Varṣa*°, *Dāna*° and *Śrāddha*°, as given in their corresponding concluding verses, has so named the works. But the respective colophons give the correct names, and this has been pointed out by Dr. Hazra in his abovementioned paper. This inaccarate naming by the editor created confusion to the late Shastri and Dr. Banerji, as is evident from their remarks, quoted above. The editor, before being so misled, has correctly named the works, while enumerating them on p. I of his preface to the V.K.K., quoted above.

108. Vide Dr. N. K. Bhattasali's paper, viz. 'A broken fragment of a new charter of Śāmalavarmā, a well-known Bengal king of the 11th century A.D.' *Modern Review*, November, 1932, pp. 529-32, at p. 532.

109. 'Govindānanda Kavikaṅkaṇācārya', Journal of Oriental Research, Madras (1951), vol. xviii, part. II, pp. 97-108

110. Published from Calcutta in Pausa, 1368, B.E. (=December, 1961/January, 1962).

(b) *The Varṣakriyākaumudī*

It has been seen above that this work, though the first in point of publication (1902) of our author's four digests, is the last in that of composition by him. Dr. Kane, though not doing sufficient justice to it in the first volume of his history, has drawn upon it a great deal in the *vrata* section of the fifth volume, part I (1958) of his same work. The principal points of difference[111] of our author with his illustrious junior contemporary, Raghunandana, have already been set forth by the editor in his preface to this work. We now propose to give here a brief resume of the contents of this work.

The V. K. K. is a voluminous work, the text itself occupying 579 pages of the printed edition. After five benedictory verses, the author devotes 27 pages (pp. 2-28) to define the characteristics of a *tithi* and its auspicious parts for the performance of religious rites. He introduces this topic with the following remarks: 'while explaining the religious duties to be performed during the year, as *tithi*-s are important for their performance, firstly, the nature of the *tithi*-s and of their holy parts, fit for the observance

111. The exact references for the fourteen points of difference between the V. K. K. and Raghunandana's *Ekādaśītattva* (E.T.), *Kṛtyatattva* (K.T.) and *Tithitattva* (T.T.) are given below. References to Raghunandana's works are from Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara's edition, Calcutta, 1895.

(1)	V.K.K.	p. 280	=T.T.	p. 62	(8)	V.K.K.	p. 301	=T.T.	p. 51
(2)	,,	p. 286	=E.T.	p. 105	(9)	,,	p. 305	= ,,	p. 53
(3)	,,	p. 251	=T.T.	p. 114	(10)	,,	p. 108	= ,,	p. 157
(4)	,,	p. 247	= ,,	p. 187	(11)	,,	p. 48	= ,,	p. 107
(5)	,,	pp. 316-7	= ,,	p. 32	(12)	,,	p. 61	=K.T.	p. 429
(6)	,,	p. 218	= ,,	p. 149	(13)	,,	p. 503	=T.T.	p. 58
(7)	,,	p. 249	= ,,	p. 30	(14)	,,	p. 500	= ,,	p. 39

It is necessary to add that both Govindānanda and Raghunandana, though differing on these 14 points, agree about the time for payment of the *dakṣiṇā* (priest's fee) for *Durgāpūjā* (worship of the Goddess Durgā in autumn), which is 'just after the conclusion of the *navamīpūjā* (worship on the ninth *tithi* of the bright fortnight of *Āśvina*) and not after the immersion of the image in water on the tenth *tithi* as prescribed by the Maithilas' (vide V K.K., pp. 447-8 ; T.T. p. 101 and the *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī* of Vidyāpati, Darbhaga, 1900-1, p. 126). Both of them have also included the topic of *Khañjana-darśana* (sight of the bird *Khañjana* or wagtail) after the *Durgāpūjā* as a decisive omen for the success or failure of a person, starting on a journey (vide V. K. K., pp. 449-51 and T.T., pp. 103-4).

of pious actions, will be described.' He then quotes three lines from the *Sūryasiddhānta*[112] to the following effect : "After leaving the sun just after the last moment of a new moon day, the moon goes daily eastward. That lunar day, divided into twelve parts is called a *tithi*." Then he says that as there are Vedic passages, prescribing the morning, noon and afternoon as proper periods of time for the performance of rites in honour of the gods, human beings and *manes* respectively, and as there are also *smṛti* texts, enjoining the worship of the gods in the morning, the word *divā* (i.e. day) is to be construed as morning, noon, afternoon or night as is consistent with the religious rite in question, which should be performed at the proper time of the appropriate day of the requisite *tithi* only. Our author next quotes two verses of the *Gṛhyapariśiṣṭa* to lay down the general rules, guiding the performance of religious rites, when a *tithi*, fit for observing them, is found on two consecutive days or is not so found. '[Combinations of] the second and third *tithi*-s, the fourth and fifth *tithi*-s, the sixth and seventh *tithi*-s, the eighth and ninth *tithi*-s, the eleventh and twelfth *tithi*-s, the fourteenth and full moon *tithi*-s, the newmoon and first *tithi*-s are producers of great religious efficacy. Other combinations of two consecutive *tithi*-s are very harmful and remove the previously acquired religious merit of the performer.' The following explanation has been offered by our author to the above two verses : 'The day in which there is a conjunction of the second and third *tithi*-s is fit for the religious rite in question and neither the preceding nor the succeeding day, with the first or the fourth *tithi* joined with them, is so fit.' Our author then describes in the next 54 pages (pp. 28-82) the duties, imperative on a devout Hindu, in the sixteen *tithi*-s beginning with the first one and ending with the full moon and the new moon *tithi*-s. The following topics are then treated fully in the following sequence :—

Actions forbidden in the particular *tithi*-s (pp. 82-90) ; solar and lunar eclipses (pp. 90-108) ; rites to be observed during these two eclipses (pp. 108-14) ; and practices forbidden after the occurrence of the eclipses (pp. 114-17). After describing the duties in the *tithi*-s in general, our author lays down the procedure of worshipping Govinda and other gods according to Vedic, Tāntric and mixed rites (pp. 117-204). He then deals (pp. 204-22) with *saṅkrānti* (i.e. the last day of a solar month in which the sun passes into the next *rāśi* or sign of the zodiac) and the particular rites to be performed at that time, including the *dadhi-saṅkrānti-vrata* (i.e. a *vrata* to be observed for a year in every *saṅkrānti*, beginning with that of the *uttarāyaṇa*, i.e. the winter solstice at the end of Pauṣa).

Our author then devotes 18 pages (pp. 222-40) to the following three connected topics in three consecutive chapters :—

(1) Definition and classification of months, such as as lunar, sidereal, solar, astral and intercalary (pp. 222-36),

---

112. V. 12 of *Mānādhyāya*, ch. xiv, MM. Sudhākara Dvivedī's edition (1909-11, B.I., work no. 173), reprinted in 1925, omits the second of the three lines.

(2) Definition of a fortnight, which is usually the half-portion of a lunar month (pp. 236-7) and

(3) Determination of a season (pp. 237-40).

We take up the above three topics in due order.

(I) Months

As the performance of all the religious duties, to be discharged in several months, depends upon the knowledge of the various kinds of months, so before going to describe those duties, an attempt is made in the following pages to define a month generally and the several months such as Caitra specially.

Somebody has said—"As Hārīta has laid down that the word 'month' (*māsa*) is indicative of the 'lunar month', so the former is primarily meant to apply to the latter only and secondarily to other kinds of months.

So says Hārīta :—

The begining of a month is to be known as the day in which sacrifices to gods, Indra and Agni, are made ; the sacrifices to gods, Agni and Soma, are prescribed to be performed in the course of that month ; while those, meant for the Pitṛs (the *manes*) and Soma, are ordained to be gone through in the concluding day of that month (*samāptau*). If the sun ever goes, crossing over that month, the month, so crossed over, is to be known as the *malimluca* (or *malamāsa* i.e. intercalary) month, while the just following month is to be reckoned as the real month (for the performance of religious duties).

Sacrifices to gods, Indra and Agni, are to be made in the first *tithi* (i.e. *pratipad*) of the bright fortnight, while those to gods, Agni and Soma, in the similar *tithi* of the dark fortnight. These two kinds of sacrifices are included within the newmoon and full moon sacrifices. The sacrifice of offering to fire, meant for the god Soma with the *Pitṛs*, is to be performed on the newmoon day. By the use of the word '*samāptau*', the word '*māsa*' (i.e. month) is to be taken as the lunar month, beginning with the first day of the bright fortnight and ending with the next newmoon day. The clause viz. "If the sun ever goes, crossing over that month, means that there is no *saṅkrānti* in that lunar month, which is to be designated as a *malimluca* (or intercalary) month."

This is wrong in view of the facts that Hārīta has described a lunar month only, fit for becoming an intercalary month in special cases, as is evident from his concluding clause viz. "If the sun ever goes etc. (*tam atikramya* etc.) and that many other sages have used the word 'month' in solar, sidereal, lunar and astral months. So the word 'month,' indicative of many senses, is primarily (and not secondarily to be applied to all the above four kinds of months. It is not to be argued that owing to the applicability of the word 'month' in many senses, it primarily means a 'lunar month' and secondarily

other kinds of months, as there is no warrant for such assumption and as all the sages have invariably used the word 'month' in all its meanings ; otherwise there arises the objection of the loss of its various meanings.

So the *Brahmasiddhānta* says :—

A lunar month is reckoned from the (first day of) the bright (fortnight) to the next newmoon day, a sidereal month consists of thirty days only, while the period, in which the sun rests in a single *rāśi* (sign of the zodiac), is known as the solar month.

Here the word '*śuklādiḥ*' (i.e. beginning with the bright) means '*śukla-pratipadādiḥ*' (i.e. from the first day of the bright fortnight), the word '*śukla*' here referring to the fortnight, designated by the same.

So also the *Varāhasaṃhitā* says :—

A lunar month is from one newmoon day to the next newmoon day, a sidereal month is of thirty days only and all those, who are proficient (in Astronomy) put the label 'solar' to the period of time, covered by the sun's staying in one *rāśi*.

Here the fifth case-ending in *darśād* (i.e. from one newmoon day) is to be taken as indicative of *avadhi* (i.e. exclusion of the newmoon day) and not of *abhividhi* (i.e. inclusion of the same). Otherwise, if we take a lunar month as beginning with a newmoon day or with the end of a newmoon day, six months of the year will vanish (as every alternate lunar month, amounting to six months in a whole year, will be thereby left out of consideration). It is not to be argued that one newmoon day is the concluding day of the previous (lunar) month, because as a result of that argument there arises the objection of one newmoon day being the parts of two such months and also because there is the convention of the existence of the several months in mutual isolation and as there arises the further difficulty of performing the annual *śrāddha* of a person, who died on a newmoon day. So in the following text of the *Viṣṇudharma* (*Viṣṇudharmottara* ?), the words such as '*sannikarṣād-athārabhya*' (i.e. beginning from the conjunction of the sun and the moon) are to be interpreted as referring to 'the period of time, just following the conjunctlon.'

The *Viṣṇudharmottara* (I. 72. 13b-16a) says :—

The moon meets with the sun at the end of the dark fortnight. The learned call the month, beginning from the conjunction of the sun and the moon (*sannikarṣād-athārabhya*) to the next such conjunction, as a lunar month. In a sidereal month there are only thirty risings of the sun (i.e. days). A solar month is reckoned by the sun's resting in a single *rāśi*, while an astral month is measured by the passage (of the moon) through all the stars.

The *Rājamārtaṇḍa* says :—

The solar month is effected by the sun's resting in one *rāśi*, the lunar month occurs during the period of the passage of the moon from the first day of the bright fortnight to the (next) newmoon day, the sidereal month is reckoned by thirty days only, while the astral month is the name given to the period of the passage (of the moon) through all the stars.

It is said in the *Ratnamālā* :—

The month, ending in a newmoon day, is called lunar, that, coinciding with the sun's resting in a *rāśi*, is known as solar, while the appellation 'sidereal' is given to a collection of thirty days and an astral month is nothing but the period of the passage of the moon through all the stars.

The *Sūryasiddhānta* (*madhyamādhikāra*, ch. I., vv 12a-13a) says :—

An astral day is said to consist of sixty *daṇḍas* (i.e. collections of twenty-four minutes) and a sidereal month consists of thirty risings of the sun (i.e. days) A lunar month is similarly composed (of thirty *tithis*) and a solar month is formed by a *saṅkrānti*.

The next rising of the sun (*arkodaya*), which amounts to a day, increases by several *palas* (i.e. collections of twenty-four seconds) over and above the usual twenty-four hours, owing to the increase of the duration of the day by reason of the sun's resting in a particular *rāśi*.

It is again stated in connection with the above in the same work (*Spaṣṭādhikāra*, ch. II, v. 59)[113] to the following effect :—

Multiply the daily motion of a planet by the time of rising of the sign in which it is, and divide by eighteen hundred ; the quotient add to, or subtract from, the number of respirations in a revolution : the result is the number of respirations in the day and night of the planet.

Thus a sidereal year is a day longer than an astral year—this is the only difference between these two years. This astral month is fit for astronomical calculations, while the already mentioned one, described in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and tantamount to the moon's passage through all the stars, is fit for general use. 'A lunar month is similarly (*tadvat*) composed' means that a lunar month also consists of thirty *tithis*.

Here, though it has been stated in an indefinite way as of 'thirty *tithis*' (*triṃśatā tithibhiḥ*), yet according to the principle of *ekavākyatā* (i.e. reconciliation of conflicting texts), applied to the previously quoted authorities such as *Hārīta*, *Brahmasiddhānta*, *Varāhasaṃhitā*, *Viṣṇudharma* (*Viṣṇudharmottara* ?), *Rājamārtaṇḍa* and others, the above phrase should be construed as of 'thirty *tithi*-s, beginning with the first *tithi* of the bright fortnight.'

So it has been said in the 13th chapter of the self-same *Sūryasiddhānta* (*mānādhyāya*, ch. xiv, v. 14a) :—

A lunar month consists of thirty *tithi*-s and the same period of time is a day of the *Pitṛs* (the *manes*).

Owing to the inclusion of the phrase 'a day of the *Pitṛs*' in the above text, the lunar month, so described, invariably consists of a bright and a dark fortnight.

As *Manu* (I. 66) says :—

---

113. The *Sūryasiddhānta* reads '*svāhorātrāsavaḥ smṛtāḥ*', while our author reads '*āhorātrāsavaḥ kramāt*' as the last foot of the above verse.

The night-and-day of the *Pitṛs* consists of a (human) month, divided into two fortnights. The day portion, which is dark (i.e. a dark fortnight), is meant for activity, while the night portion, which is bright (i.e. a bright fortnight) is for sleeping.

The word 'month' has been secondarily applied to a collection of thirty *tithi*-s in the following texts of the *Chandogapariśiṣṭa*, *Marīci* and *Viṣṇu* respectively .

(1) The six-monthly *śrāddhas* can be performed when it is one day less in six-months or three days less in a year (i.e. on the day previous to the six-monthly *tithi* of death of the person or three days prior to the annual *tithi* of the same).

(2) The principal *śrāddha* is to be performed every month, failing that, in every season.

(3) One should perform (the *śrāddha* of a just deceased person) every month in the very *tithi* of his death.

So the word 'month' is to be understood to apply secondarily to the (lunar) month, beginning with the first *tithi* of the dark fortnight and ending with the next fullmoon day.

Thus, owing to the several meanings of the word 'month', the use in the following texts of the qualified phrase 'lunar month' holds good, otherwise it would have been meaningless :—

(a) The lunar month, crossed over by the sun, is known as *malimluca* (or intercalary month).

(b) The lunar month is also to be followed in the annual *śrāddha* of the *Pitṛs* (the manes).

(c) The lunar month, in which the sun passes into Aries, is called *Caitra*.

The above discussion also silences all those who say that the word 'month' applies conventionally to the three kinds, such as the solar month and derivatively to the lunar one, which consists of the collection of thirty *tithi*-s, by virtue of the derivation of the word '*māsa*' (i.e. month) from the root '*mās*' (i.e. the moon), meaning thereby 'belonging to, (*tasyāyam*) i. e. to the moon', inasmuch as Hārīta and many other sages have applied the word 'month' to a lunar month also alike to the solar and to other kinds of months. Otherwise, that would have been useless and also because the mention of the word '*cāndra*', as used in the phrase '*cāndro māsaḥ*' (i.e. lunar month) in the texts of many sages, would have become superfluous, if the single word '*māsa*' (i.e. month) is able to bring out that meaning.

Thus it is established that months are of four kinds and that there are also four kinds of years, composed of twelve months of such four kinds of months such as the solar, owing to the following *Śruti* and also owing to the following text of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* (I. 72. 19b-20a, 21) :—

(a) Twelve months constitute a year.

(b) O son of Bhṛgu ! a year, calculated on the solar basis, is six days longer than that, if measured by the sidereal method and eleven days more than that, if calculated on the lunar basis.

It is not to be argued that the year, in which an *adhimāsa* (i.e. intercalary month) falls, is said to be composed of thirteen lunar months, as the following text has described the two months in question as one month :—

Bādarāyaṇa has (in this case) described a month as consisting of sixty days, the first half of such a month being discarded and the second half only being accepted.

This conduces to the proposition that the use of the word 'lunar year' is in relation to twelve months only, fit for religious purposes and not in relation to the additional intercalary month.

The following statement of the *Sūryasiddhānta*[114] (*mānādhyāya*, ch. xiv, v. 10b) is only to show that a solar year begins with Aries :—

The twelve months, beginning with Aries, are collectively known as a year.

Now we begin our consideration of the implications of the words, which are the names of the months, beginning with *Caitra*.

Somebody has said regarding this topic that the name of the the month '*Caitra*' holds good both in the solar and lunar months owing to the wide-spread practice. This is wrong, because, if our purpose is served in one case by implication, it is not proper to attribute many senses to one word, like the word 'white'. Otherwise there will arise the fault of cumbrousness. So it has been said that implication is better than attribution and that the theory of various meanings of a single word is accepted only for want of any other alternative, just as it has been so done in the case of *akṣa* (meaning dice, latitude, etc.) and similar other words, where the primary meaning being absent and there being no scope for implication, there is no other alternative left except the attribution of various meanings to the same word. But in the present case it connot be argued that there is absence of an alternative to the acceptance of various meanings, as the denotation of the means of the months, beginning with *Caitra*, exists in the lunar months alone.

So says Brahmagupta :—

The lunar month, in which the sun passes into Aries, is *Caitra*. Similarly, (the lunar months), such so *Vaiśākha* are formed by the sun's passage into Taurus etc.

There is also the *Śruti* :—

That is known as the newmoon day of *Vaiśākha*, which is in conjunction with the asterism *Rohiṇī*.

As owing to the established law of the joint location of the sun and the moon in the ending moments of a newmoon day and also as there is the possibility of its conjunction with the asteriom *Rohiṇī* when the sun is in Taurus and not in Aries, so we find that the *Śruti* has also corroborated the definition of Brahmagupta. On the authority of the first of the previously quoted texts of Hārīta, viz. 'The beginning of a month......the concluding day of that month', when, owing to the slow or quick motion

---

114. The *Sūryasiddhānta* reads '*māsāstaireva vatsaraḥ*', while our author reads *māsāḥ saṃvatsaraḥ smṛtaḥ.*'

respectively of the sun, both the *tithi*-s are got within that *rāśi* and there arises thereby the doubt of performing a *śrāddha*, or no such *tithi* is available, resulting in the non-performance of a *śrāddha*, it has been therein advised by him to leave aside the stamp of solar month, designate the above lunar month as *Pauṣa*, *Māgha* and so on and unhesitatingly perform the annual *śrāddha* in that month, thus singled out and he has thus established the force of the month names such as *Māgha* in the lunar months alone.

Thus in the following text the application of the names such as *Māgha* and others to solar month is rather secondary, owing to its similarity with the month, begun by the sun in Capricornus, just like the expression viz. "The boy is fire."

'The sages recommend the performance of tonsure and vows in the six months, beginning with *Māgha* and ending with the time of the beginning of the sleep of Śāraṅgin (i.e. Hari) ; a group of two months, beginning with *Māgha*, is called a season and three such seasons make an *ayana* (i.e. the total period of the sun's northward or southward march).'

So, "by reason of various uses, found in the *Brahmapurāṇa* and other works, the force of the words '*Māgha* and others primarily rests in the lunar months, ending in a fullmoon day and secondarily in such months, ending in a newmoon day"—this view is also refuted, inasmuch as the quotations from the *Śruti*, *Hārīta*, Brahmagupta and other authorities have designated a month as ending in a newmoon day and because the text of designation is more authoritative than that of analogical deduction and also because, in view of the facts that the lunar month of *Caitra*, ending in a fullmoon day, consists of thirty *tithis*, ending in a *Caitra* fullmoon day and the implied meaning must always have an expressed counterpart, it depends upon the. lunar month of *Caitra*, ending in a newmoon day.

Thus, it having been established that the use of the words '*Caitra*' etc. is in relation to the month of the same name, ending in a newmoon day, somebody has said on the authority of the *sūtras* of Pāṇini (iv. 2, 3 and iv. 2, 21) :—

" 'A period of time is designated by an asterism' and 'the fullmoon day in an asterism (gives the name to that month)' the words such as *Caitra* have been derived from the fullmoon day with the *Citrā* asterism with the further suffix *aṇ*, on the strength of the above *sūtras*."

This is wrong, because the words *Caitra* and others are also applied to *ahorātra* (day-and-night taken together), *trirātra* (three nights, i.e. three full days), *daśarātra* (ten nights, i.e. ten fulldays) and other measures of time.

If it is assumed that the words *Caitra* and others are exclusively applied to months by derivative convention, the reply is that the words *kārttika* and others are applied even though the asterisms, viz. *kṛttikā* and others, do not coincide with those months (the names of which are obviously derived from the names of those asterisms).

So says the *Jyotiṣa* :—

The ultimate and the penultimate months as also the month of *Phālguna* are known

as consisting of three asterisms each, while the remaining (nine) moths are considered as consisting of two asterisms each, as calculated from the *kṛttikā* asterism.

The meaning of the above text is :—

Two asterisms, beginning with *kṛttikā*, in nine months and three such in *Āśvina* and *Bhādra*, which are the ultimate and penultimate months (in this scheme) and also in *Phālguna*, all in conjunction with the fullmoon day, form the twelve months, beginning with *kārttika*.

Pāṇini has laid down the above-mentioned partial derivation of the month names from the names of asterisms on the general observation of facts. So it is not to be said that either of the two asterisms, *Kṛttikā* and *Rohiṇī*, is got from the word *kṛttikā* and this argument holds good in other months also, because the above-quoted text viz. 'The ultimate etc.' has also been laid down on the general observation of facts, to which the case under consideration is an exception.

As the *Brahmapurāṇa* says :—

When the *Āgneya* asterism coincides with the fullmoon day of *kārttika*, that *tithi* is said to be a great one and pre-eminently fit for bathing and fasts. When again the *Yāmya* asterism falls in that *tithi*, that is also spoken of by the sages as highly auspicious.

When also the *Prājāpatya* asterism concurs with that *tithi*, that is spoken of as the *Mahākārttikī* and is difficult to be secured even by the gods.

Āgneya, *Yāmya* and *Prājāpatya* are *Kṛttikā*, *Bharaṇī* and *Rohiṇī* respectively. Here in the above text the fullmoon *tithi* in conjunction with *Bharaṇī*, also belongs to *Kārttika* but according to the opponent it comes to the category of *Āśvina*. In the fullmoon day, falling within the period between the 16th and 26th days of the month when the sun is in Libra (i.e. in the solar *Kārttika* month), there occurs the invariable concurrence of the *Bharaṇī* asterism, in view of the fact that the above fullmoon day, included as it is within the lunar month, coinciding with the solar *Kārttika* month, is undoubtedly of the *Kārttika* month, owing to the fixed rule of the staying of the moon in the self-same serial position of the sun, when in the seventh *rāśi* (i.e. *Kārttika*) at the end of the fullmoon day. So also the conjunction with the *Rohiṇī* asterism occurs only in the *Kārttika* fullmoon day, included within the lunar month, running from the solar *Kārttika* month and falling between the 10th and 14th days of the solar *Agrahāyaṇa* month, when the sun is in Scorpio and in no other *Kārttika* fullmoon day. Similarly, in the fullmoon day, falling between the 16th and 23rd days of the month, when the sun is in Scorpio (i.e. in the solar *Agrahāyaṇa* month), there occurs the invariable concurrence of the *Rohiṇī* asterism and very seldom of the *Mṛgaśirā* asterism, in view of the fact that the above fullmoon day, included as it is within the lunar month, coinciding with the solar *Agrahāyaṇa* month, is undoubtedly of the *Agrahāyaṇa* month, owing to the fixed rule of the staying of both the sun and the moon in the self-same serial position, when in the seventh *rāśi* (i.e. *Kārttika*) at the end of the fullmoon day. In that case the conversion of the *Mārgaśirṣa*

(i.e. *Agrahāyaṇa*) month into the (astral) *Kārttika* month takes place owing to the transference of the asterism. Thus similar cases of transference of asterisms shall be understood by the learned in other months also.

Somebody has defined the *Caitra* month as 'the lunar month, begun by the sun in Pisces and beginning from the bright *pratipad* (i.e. first *tithi*) and ending in the newmoon day.' This definition is also not happy, as it is too short to cover a *Kṣayamāsa* (i.e. when a full solar month is included within a full lunar month of the above description).

So the *Jyotiṣa* says :—

An *adhimāsa* (or intercalary month) is clearly a month without any *saṅkrāntis*, while sometimes a *kṣayamāsa* occurs, having two *saṅkrāntis* included within it. The latter may happen only in the three months beginning with *Kārttika* and nowhere else and in that eventuality to *adhimāsa* (i.e. intercalary months) come up within the course of a year.[115]

The *Jyotiṣa* again says :—

When two intercalary months happen in a year and a *kṣayamāsa* invariably occurs in either of the three months, beginning with *Kārtttika*, these three months are to be carefully avoided in marriage, sacrifice, festivity and other auspicious acts.

As a *kṣayamāsa* has two *saṅkrāntis* included within it, so the possibility of the loss of one (solar) month, included within a lunar month, arises. When the sun's entrance into Sagittarius occurs in the *pratipad* of the bright fortnight and that into Capricornus in the next newmoon day, the lunar month, begun as it is by the sun in Scorpio, is *Mārgaśīrṣa* (i.e. *Agrahāyaṇa*) and the next lunar month, begun as it is by the sun in Capricornus, is appropriately *Māgha* and consequently the loss of the month of *Pauṣa* occurs, owing to the absence of the solar month, begun by the sun in Sagittarius. If you say 'Let that happen', then in that year there arises the objection of the loss of the annual *śrāddhas* to be performed in the appropriate *tithi*-s of that month, militating against the injunction of annual performance of the same.

The above discussion thus does away with such definitions as the following :—

The lunar month, which ends in a (solar) month, to be completed by the sun in

115. The obvious reason of a *kṣayamāsa*, happening only in the three months, beginning with *Kārttika*, i.e. in *Kārttika*, *Agrahāyaṇa* and *Pauṣa* only, is that these months alone may have 29 days only and a lunar month is 29½ days only, the lunar month's duration in such cases being more than the corresponding solar month's duration. The reason of two *adhimāsas* coming up within a year in the eventuality of a *kṣayamāsa* is that two *adhimāsas*, one preceding and the other succeeding a *kṣayamāsa*, prepare the ground for the opposite coincidence of the solar and lunar months by their coincidence of the same. Śaka 1885 (=1963-64 A.D.) is a recent example of the phenomenon.

Aries, is called *Caitra*'. Otherwise an intercalary month is likely to be named after the preceding solar month.

Others, again, accept the definition of Brahmagupta as good, Brahmagupta says :—

The lunar month, in which the *saṅkrānti* with the sun in Aries occurs, is *Caitra*. Similarly, the lunar months, beginning with *Vaiśākha*, are formed by the passage of the sun into Taurus etc.

Tac-caitram (i.e. that is *Caitra*)—here *Caitraḥ* (masculine gender) *eva* (is verily *Caitram* (neuter gender) with the suffix *aṇ* (Pāṇini iv. 2, 55, Vārtika 2744), added for forming a synonym, inasmuch as sometimes suffixes appended for forming synonyms, such as in words like *devatā* (feminine gender, meaning a 'god') becoming *daivata* (neuter gender with the suffix *aṇ*, also meaning 'a god'), thus change the genders of the original words. The above definition (of a lunar month) holds good in the case of a *kṣayamāsa* also, as one single month becomes designated with two names, owing to the entrance of the sun in two *rāśis* in that month. But here the fault arises in the definition being too short to include an intercalary month. Owing to the following and similar other text viz. 'The lunar month, crossed over by the sun, is known as an intercalary month,' a lunar month without any *saṅkrānti* is, indeed, an intercalary month.

It is not to be said that an intercalary month is a nameless (*anāmaka*) month, owing to the absence of any month over and above the months such as *Caitra*, on account of the maxim viz. 'An unqualified thing cannot be a general thing.' It is also not to be argued on the strength of the following text :—

The vicious nameless (*vināmaka*) month, within a year, attacked as it is with *nairṛtas* and *yātudhānas* (classes of goblins), destroys the good effects of sacrifices.

For, the above text is spurious. Even if it be a genuine one, the epithet *vināmaka* is figurative and means *vināmakapada* (i.e. assuming the role of a nameless month), owing to the absence of any religious action to be performed in the months marked as *Caitra* etc. and also owing to the use of words such as *dvirāṣāḍha* (i.e. the second *Āṣāḍha*) in such texts as the following of the *Rājamārtaṇḍa* :—

The month, in which the sun goes to the cancer after crossing over the newmoon (i.e. after the lapse of a full lunar month), is known as *dvirāṣāḍha*. Viṣṇu sleeps in the Cancer.

The word '*vināmakaḥ*' in the former text has been read as '*vināmakaiḥ*' in the *Kālamādhavīya*.

We should not say that the use of words usch as *dvirāṣāḍha* is secondary, because :—

(1) an epithet cannot be simultaneously applied to two things and an epithet cannot be double,

(2) if an intercalary month be a nameless month and a person dies in that month, his *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* (i.e. the first annual *śrāddha*) and *sāṃvatsarika* (i.e. the next following annual *śrāddhas* become impossible of performance, as such a month is without the special designation such as *Caitra* and other months and

(3) there is the absolute duty of performing the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* in the corresponding *tithi* of the next year, which is nothing but the particular *tithi* of the particular month of death of that person, otherwise there will be a serious lapse.

In another text of the *Rājamārtaṇḍa* viz. Whenever two months of the same name happen in a single year, the religious duties for the *manes* and those for the gods are to be performed in the former and in the latter months respectively, the two months have been spoken of as bearing the same designation and the word '*pitṛkāryāṇi*', occuring in the clause viz. '*tatrādye pitṛkāryāṇi*' [i.e. the religious duties for the *manes* (are to be performed) in the former], includes *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa.* There is also the text of *Hārīta* to the same effect :—

The learned do not take an intercalary month into account in the performance of the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.

In the following text of the *Bhīmaparākrama* viz. 'The lunar month, crossed over by sun, is known as an intercalary month ; the religious duties, to be performed in that month, are to be done in the next following month'—which means 'that the duties, to be discharged in that intercalary month in accordance with the prescribed order, beginning from *Vaiśākha*, are to be performed in the next following month, which is the real *Vaiśākha* month in this case', the naming of that intercalary month as *Vaiśākha* etc. has been clearly established. Otherwise that would have been improper, owing to the absence of religious duties in an intercalary month.

Moreover, in the following two texts of *Jyotiṣa* and *Hārīta* respectively, viz. "If there occurs no *saṅkrānti* in the two fortnights, bright and dark, the duties, to be discharged in that lunar month (composed of the two fortnights), are to be gone through in the next following lunar month," and "The first (*ādya*) month (in such a case) is to be known as intercalary, while the second (*dvitīya*) is the real month (for the performance of religious duties)," the appellations *ādya* and *dvitīya* (i.e. first and second) hold good only in the event of both the months bearing the same name.

In fact, in accordance with the Śruti text viz. "That is to be known as the newmoon day of *Vaiśākha*, which is in conjunction with the asterism of *Rohiṇī*", another definition of a lunar month is set out below :—

The lunar month, connected with the sun in Pisces and different from the month, begun by a *saṅkrānti* (*sasaṅkrānta*) but without the passing of the sun into Aries, is called *Caitra*. To the statement "The lunar month, connected with the sun in Pisces, is *Caitra*" is added the phrase viz. "different from the month, begun by a *saṅkrānti* (*sasaṅkrānta*) but without the passing of the sun into Aries, because the month *Phālguna* is not so different (but is such a month, begun by a *saṅkrānti*) but without the passing of the sun into Aries. The addition of the word '*sasaṅkrānta*' is to obviate the fault of excluding an intercalary month from the above definition. The epithet *mīnastha-ravi-saṃyogī* (i.e. connected with the sun in Pisces) is to do away with the defect of being too wide as to include all the months in an intercalary month.

When the sun goes to the next *rāśi* and thereby creates a *saṅkrānti* in the first

moment of the first *tithi* (after a newmoon day), with the result that the earlier month becomes, indeed, an intercalary month and the real appellation of that month is certainly applied to the later month, it being the real month (for the performance of religious duties), it is not to be argued that the above definition is too short to include that phenomenon, owing to its absence of solar connection in the previous *rāśi*. There is no narrowness in the above definition, as the solar sphere is wide enough to allow its one portion to have connection with the previous *rāśi*, inspite of the connection of its another portion with the subsequent *rāśi*. Thus 'the lunar month, connected with the sun in Aries but different from the month, begun by a *saṅkrānti* but without the passing of the sun in Taurus, is called *Vaiśākha*'—such definitions of the other months are to be understood. Thus the double naming of a single month, *kṣayamāsa*, is proper, as the definitions of two successive months apply to it, owing to the passing of the sun into the two appropriate *rāśis* of those months.

It is not to be argued that in case of a person's death in a *kṣayamāsa*, which bears the appellations of both the months, there is no possibility of the performance of his annual *śrāddha*, as on the strength of the following text of Vyāsa viz. "In case of a persons's death in the first or the second half of a *tithi*, the earlier or the later month respectively, included within the *kṣayamāsa*, is to be decided upon by the learned (for the performance of his *śrāddha*)", the prescribed procedure is to take the corresponding *tithi* of the earlier or the later month respectively in case a person dies in the first or the second half of a *tithi*. It is not to be suspected that the above-quoted text is a spurious one, as it has been cited in the western *nibandhas* such as the *Kālamādhavīya*.

The (principal) lunar months such as *Caitra* having been thus properly defined, a subsidiary lunar month of *Caitra* is to be understood as "the collection of thirty *tithi*-s ending in a fullmoon day of *Caitra*." This latter kind of month is not to be defined as "The month, begun by the sun in Pisces and commencing from the first *tithi* of a dark fortnight and ending in the next fullmoon day", as this definition is too short to include the month, begun by the sun in Aquarius and commencing from the first *tithi* of a dark fortnight. It is also not to be defined as "the dark fortnight. to be ended by the sun in Pisces and the immediatelty following bright fortnight taken together", as this definition contains the defect of excluding a *kṣayamāsa*.

Thus the words *Caitra* etc. are primarily applied to the lunar month of those names, while they impliedly refer to the solar months, due to almost universal practice. So the months *Caitra* etc. are to be understood as solar, only when there are appropriate attributes prefixed to them, in the absence of which they invariably refer to the principal lunar months and when there are references in the context to their subsidiary lunar character, they are to be so understood. The *Śuddhikaumudī* (of the present author, i.e. Govindānanda) is to be consulted for the determination of an intercalary month, which is passed over here for reasons of space.

(2) Fortnight

Somebody has said that "fortnight means the half portion of a lunar month" on the authority of various texts, such as the following :—

The *Vāyupurāṇa* (II. 21, 51) says :—

An experienced man should perform *śrādhhas* in the forenoon of a bright fortnight and in the afternoon of a dark fortnight but should not overstep *Rohiṇa* (i.e. the 9th *muhūrta* in which *śrāddhas* are performed). [The 9th *muhūrta* is between 6 hrs. 24 ms. and 7 hrs. 12ms. after sunrise.]

Manu (III. 278) says :—

Just as the later (i.e. the dark) fortnight is superior to the earlier (i.e. the bright) one for the performance of *śrāddhas*, so the afternoon is better than the forenoon for the same purpose.

The *Brahmapurāṇa* says :—

One should perform *śrāddhas* daily in the dark fortnight of the month of *Āśvina*.

Kātyāyana says :—

One should not transgreess the dark fortnight (i.e. one should perform *śrāddhas* in the same period) even by the offering of *śākas* (i.e. vegetables).

The above view is wrong, as the word 'fortnight' also applies to fifteen days of a sidereal month.

As the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* says :—

I have already said that thirty *muhūrtas* (i.e. collections of 48 minutes) constitute a day (i.e. a day and a night taken together). Fifteen such days, O Brahmaṇ ! are collectively known as a fortnight.

The *Amarakoṣa* also says :—

Thirty such (*muhūrtas*) make a day (i.e. a day and night taken together) and a fortnight consists of fifteen such days.

It is not to be argued that though the word 'fortnight' is applicable to both the above senses (i.e. half-portion of a lunar month and any other collection of fifteen days), yet owing to conventional implication, supported by the users of this word, it applies principally to the collection of fifteen *tithis*, beginning with *pratipad*. There is also not the suspicion of this reversal of its usual meaning, owing to the absence of a defining text, which is more powerful than an illustrative one. The *Amarakoṣa* has further said that 'the earlier and later fortnights are to be known as the bright and dark ones respectively and a month consists of both the fortnights.' The above definition is simply an illustration of the word 'fortnight', divided into bright and dark ones. No argument of almost universal usage holds good here by the logic that the power of conventional implication is equally forceful as definition, just as the words *Caitra* etc. refer to solar months (by virtue of almost universal usage). But it may at most be said that the words 'bright' and 'dark' have the force of applicability to the collection of fifteen *tithis*, beginning with *pratipad*.

(3) Season

The *Sūryasiddhānta*[116] (*mānādhyāya*, ch. xiv, vv. 9a-10a) says :—

The six months, following the sun's entrance into Capricornus, are collectively the period of the sun's northward march (*uttarāyaṇa*) and similarly the six months, following the sun's entrance into Cancer, are collectively the period of the sun's southward march (*dakṣiṇāyana*). Winter and other seasons are each composed of two *rāśis*.

Māgha and other months constitute a season by the sun's staying into two consecutive *rāśis*. The seasons are the following :—winter, spring, summer, rainy, autumn and late autumn. There are three seasons each in the *uttarāyaṇa* and *dakṣiṇāyana* periods respectively. So a season is the period of the sun's staying in two consecutive *rāśis*, such as Capricornus. This the definition of a season.

So the *Ratnamālā* says :—

Six seasons, viz. winter, spring, summer, rainy, autumn and late autumn happen in succession by reason of the sun's staying into two consecutive *rāśis*, beginning with Capricornus (*mṛga*).

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* says :—

Two months, created by the sun, constitute a season. This shows that the definition of a season as 'consisting of two consecutive months, calculated by the solar method', has been given.

Moreover, the *Amarakoṣa*, an authority on definitions of words (being a dictionary), says :—

"Two consecutive months such as *Māgha* constitute a season and three such consecutive seasons make up the period of the sun's northward or southward march (*ayana*)." This latter statement viz. 'three such seasons etc. definitely establishes that the measurement of a season is by means of the solar months.

The Śruti says :—

Tapas and *Tapasya* (i.e. *Māgha* and *Phālguna*) constitute the winter season, *Madhu* and *Mādhava* (i.e. *Caitra* and *Vaiśākha*) make up the spring season and *Śukra* and *Śuci* (i.e. *Jyaiṣṭha* and *Āṣāḍha*) constitute the summer season. This entire period of the sun's northward march (*udagayana*, i.e. *uttarāyaṇa*) is the day-time of the gods. *Nabhas* and *Nabhasya* (i.e. *Śrāvaṇa* and *Bhādra*), constitute the rainy season, *Iṣa* and *Urja* (i.e. *Āśvina* and *Kārttika*) make up the autumn season and *Sahas* and *Sahasya* (i.e. *Agrahāyaṇa* and *Pauṣa*) constitute the late autumn season. This entire period of the sun's southward march (*dakṣiṇāyana*) is the night of the gods,

Here, as the Śruti concludes by the words *uttarāyaṇa* (*udayana* in the Śruti text) and *dakṣiṇāyana* and as *ayana* (i.e. going, march) is invariably of the sun and

116. The *Sūryasiddhānta* reads "*ṣaṇmāsā uttarāyaṇam,*" and "*dvirāśināthā ṛtavastato' pi*" in the 1st and 3rd lines, while our author reads "*ṣaṇmāsāstūttarāyaṇam*" and "*dvirāśimānā ṛtavaste cāpi*" in the corresponding portions.

consequently the words such as *Tapas* and *Tapasya* refer by necessary implication to the solar months, so the Śruti has also described the force of the term 'season' in relation to the constituent solar months, bearing those names. So the erroneous view of some writers in applying the term 'season' to the couple of the principal lunar months of the names of *Tapas* and *Tapasya* etc. by analogy of their primary import is to be discarded.

So, while explaining the text viz. "In the thirteenth *tithi* of the dark fortnight of the (subsidiary lunar) month of *Āśvina* in conjunction with the asterism of *Māgha* in the *prāvṛd-ṛtu* (i.e. the rainy season), Yama, (the god of Death) (throws into the human world) the just deceased persons and the *manes* from his abode", the *Śrāddhaviveka*[117] (of Śūlapāṇi) (pp. 91-92) has interpreted the word *prāvṛd-ṛtu* as 'consisting of four months' in accordance with the view that 'three seasons makes a year.' Any other explanation (such as 'season of two months' for the word *ṛtu*) would have otherwise been improper, in view of the fact that the thirteenth *tithi* in coujunction with the asterism of *Maghā* falls in the principal lunar *Bhādra* month and is thus properly within the rainy season, according to the above view.

In the following text of *Marīci* viz. "One should perform the principal *śrāddhas* every month and failing to do so, in every season", the use of the word 'season' is in relation to the lunar calculation, which must needs be the subsidiary one, (as such a season comes earlier than the one by the principal lunar calculation and is thus not very much different from the solar season) owing to the absence of its specific signification of winter and other seasons and also due to the fact that there is no season in excess of the six such, beginning with winter, by virtue of the maxim, 'An unqualified statement cannot be a general statement.'

In the following statement of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* viz. "The established rule is that one should give gems to the members of the twice-born classes, specially in the fullmoon day of *Kārttika* after the lapse of the autumn", it is understood that the end of season is calculated by the subsidiary lunar month, ending in a fullmoon day (as such a fullmoon day of *Kārttika* invariably occurs in that very month, which just follows the autumnal season and not in *Agrahāyaṇa*, in which the fullmoon day of *Kārttika*, by the principal lunar calculation normally happens). So the words 'autumn' etc. are applied by implication to the couples of months, ending in fullmoon days and no suspicion of the general reversal of meaning thereby arises, owing to the absence of a defining text in its favour, which is more powerful than an illustrative text and also due to the principle of the comparative weakness of a Smṛti text than a Śruti text.

Now we begin to describe the main subject-matter of the work, covering 293 pages

---

117. The *Śrāddhaviveka* (edited with the commentary of Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkār a by Caṇḍīcaraṇa Smṛtibhuṣaṇa in Bengali characters, Calcutta, 1314 (B.E.)=1907 A.D.) reads 'prāvṛd-ṛtur atra māsa-catuṣṭayaṃ tryṛtu-saṃvatsara-matena', while our author reads 'prāvṛd-ṛtur atra *ṛtuḥ* saṃvatsara iti matena' which is meaningless.

(pp. 240-532) and accordingly enumerate in brief the different duties, incumbent on a religious-minded person and relevant to the several months, beginning with *Vaiśākha*.

The usual religious duties of this first month, along with a detailed description of the *Akṣaya-tritīyā* and *Pipītakī-dvādaśī-vratas*, cover 19 pages (pp. 240-259). Then follow the duties of the month of *Jyaiṣṭha* with a similarly detailed description of the *Savitrī-caturdaśī vrata* and a short account of *Dośaharā* (i.e. worship of the Gaṅgā), covering 24 pages (pp. 259-283). The rites of *Āṣāḍha* with a description of the *cāturmāsya-vrata*, beginning from an auspicious *tithi* of this month and ending in the similar *tithi* of *Kārttika* and thus extending over four months, cover the next 9 pages (pp. 283-292). The *Śrāvaṇa* duties, containing also the worship of the goddess Manasādevī on the fifth day of the dark fortnight of the month to secure immunity from snake-bite, are described in 5 pages only (pp. 292-297). The *Bhādra* portion is rather a long one, covering 45 pages (pp. 298-343) and includes *Rohiṇaṣṭamīvrata* or (*Kṛṣṇa-*) *janmāṣṭamī-vrata*, *Ananta-caturdaśī-vrata* and *Agastyārgha-dāna*. The *Āśvina* portion is the longest one in this work, covering as it does 112 pages (pp. 343-454) and includes *Aśvayuk-kṛṣṇapakṣa-śrāddha*, *Maghā-trayodaśī-śrāddha*, *Durgotsava-vrata* (according to the Kālikāpurāṇa), *khañjana-darśana*[118] (or sight of the bird *khañjana* or wagtail) and *kojāgara-Lakṣmīpūjā*. The portion, devoted to the month of *Kārttika*, is comparatively short, consisting of 27 pages only (pp. 455-481) and includes many miscellaneous topics such as *Preta-caturdaśī*, *Lukṣmīpūjā*, *Dyūta-pratipad*, *Bhrātṛ-dvitīyā*, *Vaka-pañcaka*, *Śrīharer-Utthānam* and *Kārttikī-vrata*. This portion also contains passing references to *Goṣṭhaṣṭamī* (i.e. worship and feeding of cows) and *Jagad-dhātrī-pūjā* (i.e. worship of Durgā in a lion-seated form) on the eighth and ninth *tithis* respectively of the bright fortnight of *Kārttika*. The chapters on *Mārgaśīrṣa* (i.e. *Agrahāyaṇa*) and *Pauṣa* are rather shorter, the former comprising 6 pages (pp. 482-487) and the latter two pages and a half only (pp. 487-490). The former includes *Navānna-śrāddha* (i.e. a *śrāddha* on account of the harvesting of new rice) with its duties, while the latter lays down the duty of performing śrāddha on the eighth *tithi* of the dark fortnight with cakes. The *Māgha* chapter covers 16 pages (pp. 490-506) and contains among others the important topics of *Māgha-saptamī-snāna* (i.e. ceremonial ablution in any river, specially in the Gaṅgā, in the seventh *tithi* of the bright fortnight of the month of Māgha), *Bhīṣmāṣṭamī-tarpaṇa* and Bhaimī-ekādaśī, in which last one has got to undergo fasting. The *Phālguna* section consists of 11 pages only (pp. 506-517) and contnins the only important topic of the *Śiva-rātri-vrata*, which is to be performed in the fourteenth *tithi* of the dark fortnight of the month. The concluding *Caitra* section, though not a large one and extending over 15 pages only

118. Vide 'A volume of studies in Indology, presented to Prof. P. V. Kane' (Poona, 1941), pp. 67-69 for the present writer's paper viz. *Khañjana-darśana* and also II (b) (II) above in this part of the present work.

(pp. 517-532), includes the highly important topic of the *Rāmanavamī-vrata*, the only authority utilized in this connection being the *Agastya-saṃhitā*[119] (altogether 32 verses from chaps. 13, 26-28).

It may be added here that the Durgotsava-vrata, according to the *Kālikā-purāṇa* and described in the *Āśvina* chapter of V. K. K., covers 85 pagas (pp. 365-449) and is thus a small treatise in itself, having been thrust into the relevant portion of the longer work, like the *Durgotsava-tattva* of Raghunandana, similarly incorporated within his *Tithitattva*. The separateness of this Durgotsava-vrata portion of V. K. K. is evident from the fact that it has been specifically named by our author as the '*Durgārcā-kaumudī*' (i.e. a manual on the worship of the goddess Durgā) and begins with a benedictory and ends with a concluding verse, the special name of this portion being given in the latter verse. The former verse expressly says that *Śrī-durgārcā* (i.e. worship of the goddess Durgā) is being considered in following pages in accordance with the prescriptions of the *Kālikāpurāṇa*, which is however, the only authority for the procedural portion (pp. 399-449) but many other Purāṇas, including the *Devī°* and *Nandikeśvara°*, both of which also contain elaborate procedures of the worship of Durgā, have also been utilized by our author in the preceding theoretical portion (pp. 365-398) of this *Durgārcā-kaumndī*.

The concluding 47 pages (pp. 533-79) deal with miscellaneous matters such as the glorification of the Gaṅgā, the religious efficacy of the *tulasī* (basil) leaf, the greatness of *śālagrāma* stone (fossil ammonite), the particular *vratas*, appropriate to the seven days of the week, worship on *Sūtikā-ṣaṣṭhī* (the sixth day after the birth of a child when the goddess is to be invoked), worship of the *Maṅgala-caṇḍikā*, worship on one's birthday, authoritative texts on miscellaneous topics, the duties of a Śūdra, of a widow and of a chaste wife.

(c) His definition of *dāna* and its detailed procedure with a concluding note on the *Dānakriyākaumudī*.

The *Dānakriyākaumudī*, (D.K.K) as we have seen earlier, is the first in composition of our author's four published digests and is also the shortest of them. It is also shorter than all other published digests on *dāna*, such as the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara, the *Dānasāgara* of Ballāla Sena, the *Dānakhaṇḍa* of the *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi* of Hemādri etc. The text portion of this work consists of 206 pages only, the preface, contents and index etc. occupying further 41 pages. Our author devotes,

---

119. Vide pp. 13-15 of the first part of the present work, for particulars about this work. It may also be stated here that V.K.K. quotes profusely from the *Agastya-saṃhitā* or the *Agastya* (which is the same as the former) in its previous portions and on pp. 537-39 also, as will be evident from the Index (p. 20) of the latter.

after the usual benedictory verses on the first page, almost 38 pages (pp. 2-39) to the following preliminary topics :—

(1) Definition of *dāna* (pp. 2-5),

(2) Determination of the specific deities, presiding over different objects of gift (pp. 5-7),

(3) Proper procedure of the acceptance of gifts (pp. 7-11),

(4) Proper procedure of the making of gifts (pp. 11-14) and

(5) Detailed procedure of the making and receiving of gifts (pp. 14-39).

We are concerned here with the first and last topics only, viz. definition of *dāna* and its detailed procedure.

(I) Definition of *dāna*

Our author first quotes Devala which is to the following effect :—

Gift, which is the making over of wealth to a person, mentioned in the Scriptures and in accordance with the procedure prescribed therein (*yathāvat*),[120] is being described here.

A verse of the *Agnipurāṇa* is next cited, the purport of which is given below :—

One should throw water on the ground after referring mentally to (*uddiśya*) a recepient. There is an end of the ocean but there is no limit to the effects of a gift.

Our author adds the following comment to the above verse :—

It must be admitted that the word *uddiśya* means here 'believing that (the object of gift) will be accepted by somebody.' If on the above understanding an article is gifted away and its acceptance is by chance not effected, the gift so made is no gift at all and conduces to nullity. One cannot say that the above procedure of making a gift is too short to include a gift of learning, as the word 'gift' is used there figuratively. Otherwise, there would arise the necessity of repeating the formula of making a gift and the teacher, who makes the gift, would also have to give *dakṣiṇā* (i.e. an accessory of gift in the shape of money) to the pupil on the authority of the following text of Vyāsa :—

A gift without a *dakṣiṇā* becomes fruitless.

On the contrary it is the teacher who receives (and does not give) the *dakṣiṇā*. Similarly figurative is the use of the word *dāna* in the phrase *abhaya-dāna* (i.e. gift of protection from fear of death etc.), as it is gift of no tangible thing at all but is the

120. The *Dānasāgara* (p. 28) and the *Śuddhitattva* of Raghunandana (p. 345) read *śraddhayā* (i.e. with a charitable attitude) instead of the above word, used by our author and explained by him as *śāstrokta-prakārakam*.

suppression of fear only. In case of a gift made to a deity there is no corresponding acceptance on the part of the latter but it is an implied gift on the assumption of its acceptance. Moreover, the offering to a god is a *yāga* (i.e. sacrifice) and the appropriate phrases used in worship, which includes an offering to the god concerned, are *śacī-yāga*, *mātṛ-yāga* etc., thereby indicating that it is a *yāga* (and not a *dāna*), whence the conclusion is that the use of the word *dāna* in those cases also is figurative. So the definition of an ordinary gift comes to be the following :—

A gift is the relinquishing of one's ownership over a thing with the intention of conferring (*uddeśyagata*) it on some other person.

By virtue of this definition giving of clothes and similar other things to servants, friends and so on amounts to a gift proper. Here the phrase *uddeśyagata* has been used to obviate the taking over by somebody of the clothes etc., cast off by the monks.

Our author now quotes *Yājñavalkya* (I. 200-203), *Viṣṇu*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* (I. 12, 30) and *Agnipurāṇa*, the purports of which are given below :—

Yājñavalkya :—

A person becomes a fit donee not by dint of learning or penance only but by the association of both with good religious habits. A learned man, wishing his prosperity, should worship and bestow cows, land, sesame, gold and similar other things on a deserving person but nothing on an unworthy individual. A person, devoid of learning and penance, should accept no gift. If he does so, he lowers down not only the donor but also his own self. One should make daily gifts to worthy recepients and specially on proper occasions, after having sanctified them, with charitable attitude and according to one's capacity, after having gone to the residence of or called at one's own residence, such persons.

Viṣṇu[121] :—

If a person makes a gift of even the entire wealth, acquired by unfair means (*anyāyādhigatām*) to an unworthy person, being himself devoid of the charitable attitude, he reaps no religious merit from such an action. But if a person, possessed of the charitable attitude and devotion, makes gift of a handful of vegetables to highly worthy man, he secures the highest prosperity.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* :—

Whatever is given away with contempt is tainted with the faults of the donor.

The *Agnipurāṇa* :—

A gift, made to a Vedic student, is increased hundredfold, that to a person, who has understood the sacred lore, becomes endless in merit and that to an officiating priest assumes permanence in effect.

---

121. Quoted in the *Dānasāgara* (p. 33) as from Devala with two minor changes and one important different reading, viz. *api nyāyāgatām* (i.e. even if acquired by proper means) instead of *anyāyādhigatām*.

(II) Its detailed procedure

The more important matters of this rather long topic, covering 25 pages, are set out below :—

(1) In the formula of making a gift, there occurs the phrase, viz. *Viśiṣṭa-bhārata-varṣākhya-bhūpradeśe* [i.e. in the tract of land, specially designated as *Bhāratavarṣa* (i.e. India)]. After saying this our author adds by way of comment that the mention of the requisite in the form of the name of the country such as the above is necessary. Otherwise, the gift, if made in any other country which is not a land of religious actions, will be rendered null and void. Our author quotes the following text of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* in support of his above argument :—

O sage ! heaven is reached and salvation attained from this country (i.e. *Bhārata-varṣa*) alone, which is also the place, where men are born as lower animals and suffer from the torments of hell. No other tract of land exists on the earth for the mortals, where they are called upon to discharge their religious duties.

(2) The above formula also contains the word *'adya'* (i.e. to-day) in the phrase viz. *adyāmuke māsi*, in defence of which our author says that though we get the very *tithi*, fortnight and month from other words of the formula, yet this very word *adya* has been additionally inserted in it on the authority of the texts of sages, as recorded in the Agnipurāṇa, Skandapurāṇa, Śaṅkha-Likhita and Garuḍapurāṇa and also by force of inference from the use of the particle *ca* (i.e. and). occurring in the phrase, viz. *māsa-pakṣa-tithīnāñca* (i.e. *and* of the month, fortnight and *tithi*) in a text of the Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa and implying thereby that 'to-day, consisting of a day and a night, i.e. 24 hours', is to be understood from it.

(3) Here say the *Tīrabhuktīyas*[122] :—

"As the word *adya* means 'in this day' and the word 'day' implies the day-portion only and not 'day and night taken together', so the use of the word *adya* is unjustified in the case of the performance of a religious act at night, where the phrase *asyāṃ rātryām* (i.e. in this night) is preferable."

Our author, after having quoted the above, condemns the use of the latter phrase, as suggested by the Maithilas by force of the argument that the word *adya*, though literally meaning 'this day', is always used to indicate 'day and night taken together' and thus invariably applies to this bigger period of time, just as the word *sadyaḥ*, though literally meaning 'in the same day', implies 'immediately'. He then quotes the *Amara-koṣa*, Caṇḍīdāsa's commentary on the *Kāvyaprakāśa* of Mammaṭa Bhaṭṭa, *Manu* (V. 83) and many other authorities in support of his above interpretation.

(4) Our author then says in a learned disquisition that in spite of the absence of

---

122. The printed edition wrongly reads *Tīrabhaktīyāḥ*, which should be *Tīrabhuktīyāḥ*, meaning 'the residents of *Tīrabhukti*' i.e. the Maithilas, *Tīrabhukti* being a synonym of *Mithilā*.

a text, prescribing the specific mention of the month etc. in making gifts of beds and other things in a *śrāddha* in the second day, calculated from the ending day of impurity (*aśaucānta-dvitīya-dine*), such mention is also to be made on that day. He then incidentally refutes the following argument of the moderner :—

"On the authority of the use in the *Viṣṇusūtra* and *Matsyapurāṇa* of the phrases, viz. *aśauca-vyapagame* (i.e. after the expiry of the impurity) and *sūtakānte* (i.e. at the end of the uncleanliness), the cessation of the unclean period is shown as the occasion and so the use of the phrase viz. *aśaucāntād-dvitīye' hani* (on the second day, calculated from the ending day of impurity) does not hold good in a *śrāddha*, intended for a single person (*ekoddiṣṭa*) and performed along with the gift of beds etc. on the very day of death in cases of immediate purity. So the ancient usage of pronouncing the words, viz. *aśaucāntādvitīye'hani* is to be discarded and invariably substituted by the phrase viz. *aśauca-vyapagame.*"

Our author says by way of refutation that the above innovation of the moderner is also to be rejected on the authority of the specific mention of the previous phrase in the *Matsyapurāṇa* and also by force of the logic that immediate purity (*sadyaḥ śauca*) is no impurity at all, as laid down by *Gotama*, *Yājñavalkya* (III. 28-29), *Parāśara*, *Manu* (V. 78) and *Śaṅkha*. Even in a case of immediate purity, which occurs when one gets the news of the death of his relation after the lapse of a whole year and when one becomes ceremonially purified just after taking a bath, there is no authority for prescribing the performance on that very day of the gift of the bedding requisites etc., as required in a *vṛṣotsarga-śrāddha* (i.e. a *śrāddha* with the additional rite of letting loose a bull for the benefit of the soul of the just deceased person) and the reasoning of its performance on the very day is necessarily weaker than the express text of the *Matsyapurāṇa*, prescribing it to bs performed on the next following day. Moreover, if on the above reasoning of the moderner we accept the formula viz. 'after the expiry of the impurity' and if any obstacle arises in the performance of the *vṛṣotsarga-śrāddha* etc. on that very day (i.e. the eleventh day, calculated from the day of death), which is the 'day following the end of impurity', such *śrāddha* becomes fit to be performed on any following day whatsoever. So though the eleventh day is the proper day on account of its just following the expiry of impurity, yet it can by no means be qualified by the epithet viz. 'after the expiry of the impurity', inasmuch as when one comes to know of immediate purity at night or in the case of a *pakṣiṇī aśauca* (i.e. impurity extending over a day and a half—from one day's sunrise to the next day's sunset), when the impurity expires in the night itself, which is unfit for ordinary *śrāddhas* and the next following day is not the day, immediately after the expiry of impurity, there arises the impossibility of the performance of the *śrāddha* itself. Moreover, though the expiry of impurity is the deciding factor of the proper time of the *śrāddha*, yet if some other impurity intervenes or bleeding starts on the person of the performer on that very day, it becomes thereby unfit and the next day after the expiry of this second impurity becomes so fit, when *vṛṣotsarga* and similar other rites are to be performed.

Again, on the authority of the following text of the *Devīpurāṇa* it becomes evident that the proper time of a *śrāddha* is just on reaching a place of pilgrimage :—

"One should immediately perform a *śrāddha* just on reaching a place of pilgrimage."

But if one reaches such a place at night and bleeding etc. prevent the performance of the *śrāddha* on the just following day, the *śrāddha* so deferred is to be performed on the day just after the expiry of this new impurity, which is the proper time of its performance. So the case being a bit different here, the above decision has been based on the authority of the texts of *Hārīta*, using the phrase viz. *Śvo bhūte* (i.e. on the next following day) and of *Vaijavāpagṛhya*, containing the word *aparedyuḥ* (i.e. on the next day), read with the above-mentioned text of the *Matsyapurāṇa*, viz. *aśaucāntād dvitīye'hni* (i.e. on the day just after the expiry of impurity). But on the authority of special texts the *śrāddha*, intended for a single person, is to be gone through on the eleventh *tithi* of a dark fortnight and similar other day (i.e. a newmoon day). So the earlier authorities prescribe even in cases of immediate purity the offering of the ten *piṇḍas*, shaving and cleansing the house and clothes only on that very day but defer the performance of the *vṛṣotsarga*, *ekoddiṣṭa* etc. on the very next day, as these are prohibited to be performed on that very day after shaving.

Somebody has recommended the use of the phrase viz. *śuddhidine* (i.e. on the day of purity), which is also to be discarded owing to its inapplicability in cases of *pakṣiṇī* and similar other kinds of impurity. *So the ancient usage of the formula aśaucāntād dvitīye' hani is justified.*

(5) Though in the following texts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (II.86.2ab) and *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, the names of the articles to be donated with those of their recepients are mentioned, yet the effects of those donations are not expressly stated therein :—

The *Rāmāyaṇa* says :—

Then (he) gave away wealth to Brāhmaṇas for (the spiritual benefit of the soul of) his father.

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* says :—

He, who, being possessed of riches, should give to Brāhmaṇas wealth in the shape of jewels, clothes, land, conveyances and all other things to enjoy for our spiritual benefit...............

Our author says that one is not to conclude that in the absence of any express mention of the definit results of thses gifts that heaven is the result by virtue of the maxim of the *Viśvājit* sacrifice (where heaven is considered to be the result in the absence of any specifie mention). He is of opinion that the results are to be inferred here from similar other texts, specifying them, as there is no propriety of making any inference of the attainment of heaven as the result here and also because that procedure leads to cumbrousness.

Somebody has also prescribed on the authority of the following longer text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (II.86.2-3) (which occurs after the performance by Bharata of the *śrāddha* of his father, Daśaratha) that the gifts, specified here, are to be made after the performance

of the *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha.* Our author, disapproving of this prescription, says that as a śrāddha is to be invariably performed at noon and as a gift is always to be made in the forenoon and also because the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in question simply lays down the handing over of the various articles of gift (and not the ceremonial act of giving), such donations are to be made before the performance of the śrāddha and that this conclusion is in consonance with the established practice of the śiṣṭas (i.e. the cultured persons).

The *Rāmāyaṇa* text is to the following effect :—

Then (he i. e. Bharata) gave away wealth to Brāhmaṇas for (the spiritual benefit of the soul of) his father, such as costly jewels, cows, beasts of burden, conveyances, maid-servants and man-servants, very big houses and magnificent ornaments on the occasion of the (deceased) king's obsequies.

(III) A concluding note on the D.K.K.

Though our author treats in the D.K.K. of 38 gifts only against 1375 ones, described in the *Dānasāgara*, yet the treatment of the former closely follows that of the latter, as will be evident from the appendage of the relevant Vedic mantras to each of the above gifts, following the practice of Ballāla Sena and unlike that of the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara and other later digest-writers on *dāna.* Not only in the main subject-matter but also in the preliminary topics nos. (2), (3) and (4), enumerated above and relating to the determination of the specific presiding deities and proper procedures of the making and receiving of gifts, our author's treatment is nothing but a faithful copy[123] of the encyclopaedic *Dānasāgara,* which is almost the earliest and most comprehensive treatise on the bestowal of gifts. Readers are referred to the present writer's Introduction to his edition[124] of this latter work for a description of its contents.

123. The only important exception is the topic viz. *kanyādāna* (i.e. giving away a maiden in marriage, pp. 74-80 of D.K.K.). Though both the *Dānasāgara* (vv. 5 and 19, pp. 49-50) and the D.K.K. quote verses from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* (III. 301, 15a and 29a) in the topic on the procedure of acceptance of gifts (along with the names of the presiding deities of the various articles donated), which verses mention the name of a maiden as one of the things to be given away in a particular manner and with the utterance of the name of a particular presiding deity, yet the former elaborate work has omitted *kanyādāna* from its treatment ; but the latter manual has included it in its description. Another exception, which is of minor importance, is the topic viz. *śālagrāma-śilā-dāna* (i.e. gift of the *śālagrāma* stone, i.e. fossil ammonite, used as an emblem in the worship of Viṣṇu). It covers 8 lines only on p. 65.

124. Published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* as work no. 274, 1953-56.

(d) His definition of *aśauca*

The *Śuddhikaumudī* as we have seen above, is the second in composition of our author's four published digests and is midway in size among all of them. The text portion contains 360 pages and is divided into three separate portions, viz. (I) *aśauca* (ceremonial impurity), pp. 1-180, (II) *kālaśuddhi* (determination of and acts forbidden in a *malamāsa* or intercalary month), pp. 180-296, and *dravya-śuddhi* (determination of purity of things like water) pp. 297-360. We are concerned here with the definition of *aśauca*, as stated by our author in the very beginning (pp. 1-5) of that work.

Śuddhi (ceremonial purity) consists in the eligibility of performing acts, laid down in the Vedas, which eligibility varies with every different act. The particular mandatory prescriptions about the proper person, proper time etc. for the performance of any specific act, are collectively known as the *śuddhi* of the same. It is not to be argued that the above definition does not apply to the case in which there is ineligibility owing to the non-performance of the *ācamana* (i.e. sipping of water), which is a necessary part of the religious act, inspite of the existence of *śuddhi*. The eligibility *does* exist even in that case. But since such acts as putting on the upper garment, *ācamana* etc., which are the requisites of the act itself, are left undone, a deficiency in the parts of the act occurs and thereby the acl itself becomes doubled (i.e. by doing the undone parts with the done once over again). So it cannot be said that there is absence of *śuddhi* in that case and, therefore, that *ācamana* is spoken of as a part of the act itself.

Now with the intention of determining *śuddhi* we shall first describe the *śuddhi* of *aśauca*, through the process of defining the latter, which is the opposite of the former.

Somebody has said that '*aśauca* consists in the production of ineligibility of contact with one's kith and kin in cases, where such ineligibility can be removed by actions other than *śānti* (i.e. propitiation of the malefic planets etc.)' This is wrong, because the above definition does not apply to those cases of *aśauca*, where the period of untouchability of each other's person has been over and also to cases of the birth of *sapiṇḍas* (i.e. agnates within seven degrees) or of a daughter. It cannot also be said that '*aśauca* is nothing but the ineligibility of performing religious acts in cases, where such ineligibility can be removed by actions other than *śānti*', as this definition cannot apply to cases of immediate purity (*sadyaḥ śauca*), where the impurity is removable by simple bathing. The above definition is also too wide to include bleeding, shaving, belching, vomitting, etc., as the text of the *Kālikāpurāṇa*[125] lays down that all the above render the

---

125. "One should not even perform one's daily duties, if there is a wound on a portion of the body above the knees, birth or death in the family of one's agnates, shaving, sexual intercourse, belching, vomitting, touching leeches, snakes and worms called *kṛmi* and *gaṇḍūpada* intentionally with the hands."

religious act null and void. The deferred *śrāddha*, intended for a single person and to be performed on such days, is done in those cases in the next following days. The definition is also too wide, as it might include the cases of menstruation of women.

Basing on the statement of *Manu* (v. 66),[126] occurring in the context of *aśauca*, it should not also be argued that there is *aśauca* for a woman even in her menstruation period. For a defiinition should be formulated with reference to the thing to be defined, which should not, on the contrary, be so changed as to fit in with the definition. Otherwise there will be an unwarranted licence. The word *aśauca* is also found neither in the *dharmaśāstra* works nor in popular usage to apply to any kind of act, involving any kind of uncleanliness, such as menstruation of a woman, bleeding, shaving, vomitting, touching a leech etc. On the contrary, the text of *Yājñavalkya*[127] (III. 30a) has differentiated between *aśauca* and any other kind of uncleanliness and has thus prohibited the use of the word *aśauca* in the case of menstruation of a woman.

Manu has, in the verse referred to above, spoken of the purification even in the case of menstruation of a woman in course of his prescription of the same in the case of abortion. It does not mean that menstruation is an *aśauca* ; otherwise the performance of the rites, subsequent to *aśauca*, would have been prescribed. Besides, on the strength of the text of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*,[128] there will be the possibility of offering *piṇḍas* to a just deceased person by a woman ever during her menses. Because this would be a case similar to one, where a person is enjoined to offer *piṇḍas* wlth regard to a dead relative, even if he is undergoing *aśauca* due to some other cause. Besides there would be the possibility of performing expiatory rites, to be performed on account of the partaking of meals from persons, who are bleeding, vomitting etc., as is the case on doing the same from a person undergoing *aśauca*.

Moreover, the word *aśauca*, implying any kind of uncleanliness, removable by efforts and the term *sūtaka*, meaning only the kind of impurity, arising out of birth and death, have different imports, being themselves in the nature of the general and special terms. So in accordance with the text of *Ṛṣyaśṛṅga*,[129] prescribing the general impurity

---

126. "In case of miscarriage a woman becomes ceremonially purified in nights (i.e. fulldays), equal to the number of months she was carrying and a menstruating woman also becomes similarly pure by taking a bath after the cessation of the menses."
127. "If a person is touched by a menstruating woman or a person undergoing *aśauca*, he should then take a bath and then touch all other persons."
128. "If there is an *aśauca*, all the persons of the same *gotra* become untouchable, but if the *aśauca* falls within the period of the performance of *śrāddha* for a just deceased person, the *piṇḍas* should be offered for the propitiation of the soul of such person (i.e. his *śrāddha* should be performed)."
129. "If an *aśauca* falls before the performance of *śrāddha* to the fathers, the same should be performed after the expiry of *aśuuca*."

and that of *Śaṅkha*[130] (xv. 24), laying down the special one and also due to the occurrence of the word *preta-piṇḍa-kriyā-varjam* (i.e. except the rites of offering *piṇḍas* to a just deceased person) in the latter text, the above word serving the purpose of an exception to an exception, the performance of the annual *śrāddha*, intended for a just deceased person, to be performed on the *tithi* of death of that person, becomes imperative within the period of impurity.

[The Ms. *Kha* reads the following extract here instead of the sentence viz. 'So in accordance......period of impurity,' just above :—

As an offering of the (*pūraka*) *piṇḍas* on the tenth day of death of a deceased person, if made in a period of *sūtaka* impurity, is rendered null and void owing to the prohibition of its performance at such a time and as also the special saving phrase viz. *preta-piṇḍa-kriyā-varjam* does away with the similar prohibition of performance of the annual *śrāddha* of a just deceased single person, to be performed on the *tithi* of death of that person, falling within the period of *aśauca*, due to birth or death, so the latter becomes fit to be performed even in such *aśauca*, owing to the applicability of the word *aśuddhi* (i.e. impurity) to general cases and due to that of the word *sūtaka* to special cases. Further, the texts of *Ṛṣyaśṛṅga* and *Śaṅkha* refer to different contexts, the former concerning itself to the impurity other than that arising out of birth and death.]

If we take the words *aśauca* and *sūtaka* to be synonymous, then there arises the conflict of two contradictory texts, bearing on the same topic, which, being reconciled by the principle of *eka-vakyatā* (i.e. the maxim of two or more conflicting texts forming a contextual whole), lay down that the annual *śrāddhs* as well as that intended for a just deceased single person is to be performed on the expiry of the *sūtaka* and not otherwise. So on the authority of the text, "If an obstacle arises during the course of performance of a *śrāddha* or if the day of death of the person, for whom the *śrāddha* is to be done, is not known, the same should be gone through on an eleventh *tithi*, specially of a dark fortnight," the annual *śrāddha* and that intended for a just deceased single person, (the performance of which has been obstructed on account of menstruation of the performing woman), are to be performed on the eleventh *tithi* of a dark fortnight and not after the cessation of the menses.

The approved usage of the entire *Gauḍa* country (i.e. Bengal) is that a *śrāddha*, obstructed due to the presence of a wound or of dysentery, may be performed after they have been cured.

In fact, the word *aśauca* has got the special meaning of only that kind of absence of purity, which is due to birth or death and is thus synonymous with the word *sūtaka*. So *Dakṣa* (VI. Ia) has defined *aśauca* thus :—

---

130. "A gift, an acceptance of gift, *homa* (i.e. oblation to fire), study of the Vedas and obsequial rites for the father, except the offering of *piṇḍas* to a just deceased person (*preta-piṇḍa-kriyā-varjam*), cease in a *sūtaka*." (*Śaṅkha* reads '*aśaucam*' for '*sūtaka*.')

"I shall now describe *aśauca*, which arises only out of the birth or death of a person."[131]

Therefore, the definition of *aśauca* is the incapacity of doing acts, enjoined by the Vedas, on account of birth or death of a person.

It is not to be argued that the above definition is too short to apply to cases of partaking of meals of a person, undergoing *aśauca* and of lamentation in the company of the corpse, touching it etc., inasmuch as death, along with such partaking etc., causes the incapacity of doing the acts spoken of. In cases of the sight of *Rāhu* (i.e. of a solar or lunar eclipse), the *aśauca* due to death is extended, by analogy, to avoidance of cooked food, throwing away of the cooking pots, taking a purificatory bath etc., in accordance with the text of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*,[132] although there is no *aśauca* in such cases.

Aśauca may also be defined as "the unforeseen result, arising out of birth or death and bringing about incapacity of doing acts, enjoined by the Vedas."

---

131. Our author reads *'aśaucantu pravakṣyāmi mṛtyu-prasava-lakṣaṇam,'* while *Dakṣa* reads *'sūtakantu pravakṣyāmi janma-mṛtyu-samudbhavam.'*
132. "In cases of eclipse, there is *aśauca*, similar to that on the death of a person."

(e) His definition of *śrāddha*

The *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī*, which, as we have seen above, is the third of our author's published digests, is almost as big as the Varṣakriyākaumudī, covering 560 pages against 579 of the latter. We are concerned here with the definition of *śrāddha*, as stated by our author in the very beginning of this work (pp. 2-5).

(1) Somebody has said that 'the offering of *havis* (i.e. clarified butter) by taking hold of a vessel, sanctified with the mantra viz. 'The Earth is your vessel' (*Gobhila, Śrāddhakalpa*, II. 22) is a *śrāddha*.' This is wrong, as this definition does not include a *piṇḍapitṛyajña* (which is an offering of *piṇḍas* i.e. funeral cakes only to the *manes*). It cannot be said that a *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is not intended to be included within the category of *śrāddhas*, for Gobhila, after having mentioned a *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, has said, 'that is another kind of (*itarad*) *śrāddha* to be performed on a newmoon day' and has thus accepted it as a *śrāddha*. One cannot say that the literal meaning of the above *sūtra* of Gobhila is that 'the above act of *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and another, called *śrāddha* (*itarac-chrāddham*), which is described as a sacrificial gift from a vessel, are to be performed on the newmoon day. Because there is the general rule of the presence of a substantive to be qualified by such adjectives as *itara* (i.e. another) and because in this case the substantive *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, in apposition as it is with *itarad* (another), is known to belong to the same class as a *śrāddha*, just like the expression '*anyo ghaṭaḥ*' (i.e. another pot), otherwise the act, designated by *itara*, becomes a nullity.

Moreover, if it is supposed that the above interpretation does not cover an *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha* (i.e. a *śrāddha* intended for a single person) and a *nitya* (i.e. daily) *śrāddha*, as the mantra, quoted by Pāraskara, viz. "After having offered the remnants of the objects of sacrifice and taken hold of the vessel, he mutters 'The Earth is your vessel' ", debars the seizing of the vessel in the above two cases, the reply is that the word *amṛta* (i.e. ambrosia), occurring in the mantra (used in the above two cases), viz. '*mantre amṛtaṃ juhomi*' (i.e. I make an offering of ambrosia into fire with the mantra), is a synonym of the 'remnants of the objects of sacrifice' and the act is thus a part of the seizing of the vessel. So says *Manu* (III. 275b) :—

The leavings of an eating are *vighasa* and the remnants of a sacrifice are *amṛta*.

It is not to be argued that there is a *lakṣaṇā* (i.e. implication), equivalent to a *svadhā*, in the above mantra of Gobhila, in accordance with the text, "while muttering 'The Earth is your vessel', one should think the food offered as ambrosia", as the remnants of a sacrifice are considered equivalent to a *svadhā* and there is no obstacle to the comprehension of the expressed meaning in the text and also because an implied meaning is never applied to a mantra.

(2) Another person has said that 'the offering of *havis*, after having invoked gods in the Vedic way, is a *śrāddha*. This definition also is incorrect, as it covers the *tarpaṇa* (i.e. offering of water to the *manes*) of the followers of the Yajurveda. It should not also be argued that the word *havis* means eatables also (and not simply clarified butter) and as no offering of water can be made to fire, so the above definition is not wide enough to include an offering of water to the *manes*, as *Manu* (III. 72a) has prescribed *nityaśrāddhas* with the following words :—

One should perform *śrāddhas* daily with eatables and similar other things or with water.

In that case the above definition is too short, there being no possibility of an offering of water to be made to fire and, moreover, two mutually independent propositions, viz. the idea of a *śrāddha* being concomitant with that of an injunction of offering into fire as one of its components and *vice versa*, become unavoidable. The above definition is also too wide, as it includes the *ambikahomas*, which are not *śraddhas*, with the mantra viz. '*ambe ambike* etc.', where the god for the offering of the *havis* is to be invoked with the above mantra, according to the Vedas.

(3) The following defiinition of the (*Kṛtya*-) *Kalpataru* (of Lakṣmīdhara) (Vol. IV, *Śrāddhakāṇḍa*, G.O.S., CX, 1950, p. 4) is also not a happy one, viz. 'A *śrāddha* is the offering of *havis*, meant for the *manes* and accepted by Brāhmaṇas', as it does not cover the *śrāddhas* for their own selves by ascetics, for gods and for Sanaka and others and is also too wide, as it includes the gift of offerings to the *manes*.

(4) Another authority has defined *śrāddha* as an offering of *havis*, preceded by that of any of the five requisites, such as sandalpaste.' This definition is also to be discarded, as it is too short to include *piṇḍapitṛyajñas* and also too wide, as it covers worship of Viṣṇu and similar other acts. In fact, *the real definition of a śrāddha* is to the following effect :—

A *śrāddha* is the principal offering of *havis*, meant for (*manes*, gods etc.), invoked by using words, as laid down in the Vedas and exclusive of *tarpaṇa* and in which one relinquishes one's ownership (over the things offered in favour of another person).

The meaning of the above definition is that the word *havis* here is intended to include all eatables, laid down in the Vedas, as indicated by the following text of *Manu* (III. 247) and similar ones of many other sages :—

The rice, partaken by ascetics, milk, *soma* juice, unaffected meat and mineral salt are naturally called *havis*.

(a) So the definition is not too wide, as the invocation viz. 'O Viṣṇu ! this is your food, I bow down to you' is not wrongly included within it, as the words of address lack the prescription of the Vedas.

(b) The same charge of undue width cannot also be levelled against this definition on the ground that it erroneously incorporates the following offering to Viṣṇu with the words. 'O Lord ! I offer this *havis* to you, O Hari be pleased with it', as the latter half of the above text, viz. 'It is the mantra for offering after dedication to the

particular god and is to be appiled to all forms of worship,' clearly explain its real nature, which is as the mantra for offering *naivedya* (i.e. rice, fruits, sweets etc.) and not as a mantra for relinquishing one's ownership over a thing.

(c) The above definition does not also suffer from the fault of undesired width in relalion to an *ambikahoma* which is excluded from its compass, as the words of address therein are of the Vedas and *not as laid down in the Vedas.*

(d) The word *tarpaṇetara* (i.e. exclusive of *tarpaṇa*) is meant for excluding from its applicability the *tarpaṇa* (i.e. offering of water) for those followers of the Yajurveda, who are just deceased.

(e) The word *pradhāna* (i.e. principal) must be attached to the definition to exclude *arghya* (i.e. offerings of sunboiled rice, sesamum etc.) and *piṇḍa* (i.e. funeral cakes), which are subsidiary elements of a *śrāddha*, the offering of rice being the principal one, in view of the following text of Hārīta, discarding *arghya* and *piṇḍa* in a *śrāddha*, viz. 'A *nitya* (i.e. daily) *śrāddha*, which should be offered to no particular god, should be without *arghya* and *piṇḍa* ; but it is impossible to do away with the principal element, viz. offering of rice. Though the above two subsidiary elements assume the role of the principal in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and offering of *piṇḍas* at Gayā owing to their being other forms of *śrāddha*, yet the above definition is not too short for them also. Again though *piṇḍa* and *arghya* are generally subsidiary elements, yet they are in a sense principal ones in a *vṛddhiśrāddha*, the real purpose of which is attainment of prosperity and also in a *śrāddha* for gods, which *Manu* has eulogized for its effect of protection in the following text (III. 194) :—

Of them, *śrāddha* for gods should be performed first of all, as it is in the nature of protection, otherwise the Rākṣasas (i.e. goblins) destroy a *śrāddha*, which is devoid of protection from their depredations.

(f) So the above defiinition is not too short in all their cases, where like the assumption of the principal role of the muttering of prayers (in the morning, noon or evening), though a subsidiary element, it is in the nature of a principal one.

(g) Similarly, the definition holds good in the case of *śrāddhas* for their own selves by asceties, those by persons whose fathers are living at that time and those for Sanaka and others.

It may be added here that the 18th century Bengali commentator Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra wrote a commentary on the *Śrāddhaviveka* of Śūlapāṇi, a Bengali digest-writer of the 14th century and provincial predecessor of our author. While explaining the definition of *śrāddha*, formulated by his author, Śrīkṛṣṇa rejects it and almost accepts the above definition of our author, after having quoted without acknowledgement much of his arguments, recorded by us above.[133]

133. Vide the *Śrāddhaviveka*, pp. 8-12.

(f) His refutation of Śrīdatta's views

MM. Dr. P. V. Kane says on p. 365 of his *History of Dharmaśāstra* Vol. I that 'Śrīdatta is more frequently quoted in the *Śrāddhakriyākaumudī* of Govindānanda than almost any other author or work.' From a glance at the Index (pp. 14-15) of the Śr. K. K. we find 29 entries against Śrīdatta. Now as Govindānanda names no work of Śrīdatta in his above work, so the relevant works, from which Srīdatta's views are quoted by him must be the *Pitṛbhakti* and *Śrāddhakalpa*, two manuals on the śrāddha rites for the students of the Yajurveda and Sāmaveda respectively (Kane, op. cit., p. 364), as the subject-matter of the three works, viz. the Śr. K. K., *Pitṛbhakti* and *Śrāddhakalpa* is the same, viz. śrāddha.

Neither the *Pitṛbhakti* nor the *Śrāddhakalpa* has been printed. There is a MS. of the former only in the Deccan College collection (No. 152 of 1892-95) of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, while the existence of the latter can be inferred from its mention in the former and in the *Samayapradīpa*, another work of Śrīdatta (Deccan College MS. No. 371 of 1875-76). Before proceeding to identify the quotations from Śrīdatta in the Śr. K.K., we wish to make a short remark. Dr. Kane says in his section on Śrīdatta Upādhyāya (op. cit., p. 364), 'Another work of his is the *Chandogāhnika* on the daily duties for Sāmavedins. He refers to it in his *Samayapradīpa* 871 and *Pitṛbhakti*.' And then in footnote 871 he says *'uktamasmābhir-āhnike'* folio 53a of *Samayapradīpa*, D.C. MS. No. 371 of 1875-76 ; *'na ca sapatnīkānāmiti prapañcitam-asmābhiś-chandogaśrāddhakalpe' Pitṛbhakti*, folio 24a.' But the work *Chandoga-śrāddha-kalpa* is not the *chandogāhnika* but the *Śrāddhakalpa* for the *chandogas* i.e. Sāmavedins. As no MS. of the *Śrāddhakalpa* is available, we have tried to identify the quotations in the Śr. K. K. from Śrīdatta in the MS. of the *Pitṛbhakti* only and have succeeded in tracing seven only out of the twenty-nine. A noticeable feature of these twenty-nine quotations is that they are mostly, with some exceptions, refutations of the views of Śrīdatta by Govindānanda, unlike those in the works of Caṇḍeśvara and Raghunandana, who have almost always accepted Śrīdatta's views.[134]

Of the seven identified quotations from the P.B. the first is on p. 85 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that the mention of *adya* (to-day), as recommended by Śrīdatta, is also done away with. This quotation occurs in the topic of the *śrāddha-pūrva-dina-kṛtya* (i.e. duties to be performed on the day, previous to the day of *śrāddha*) of the Śr. K.K. and formulae of inviting Brāhmaṇas for several śrāddhas are found and folio 3b of the P.B. with the word *adya*, inserted in their beginnings. The second quotation is on p. 137 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that Śrīdatta and others have read *saṃsravaṇādi ca* for *saṃsravamāditaḥ* in a text of the *Matsyapurāṇa*, cited just above, have explained

134. Vide II (b) IV above and the present writer's monograph viz. *'Raghunandana's indebtedness to his predecessors'*, pp. 189-90.

the word *ādi* as referring to the sesame, flowers and *pavitra*-stalks, remaining in the vessel of articles of worship and have opined that the *nyubja* is to be performed after placing the *pavitra*-stalks in the vessel of the *manes* : Govindānanda disapproves of this view on the authority of Pāraskara, Gobhila and Yājñavalkya and the established usage of all places. The reading *saṃsravaṇādi* (*ca* being omitted through copyist's error) in the text of the *Matsyapurāṇa*, the interpretation of the word *ādi* and the decision to perform the *nyubja* in the prescribed manner are all found on folio 25a of the P.B. The third quotation is on p. 138 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that on the authority of the *Mahābhārata*, interpreting the word *uttara* as *vāma*, the *pavitra*-stalks are to be placed on the left side of the Brāhmaṇas, according to Halāyudha, Śrīdatta and the author of the *Śrāddhapradīpa*. This interpretation is found on folio 25b of the P.B. and the opinion of Halāyudha's *Śrāddhādhyāya* is appended just after it. The fourth quotation is on p. 179 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that the view of the moderner, who follows Śrīdatta and finds fault with ancient usage and recommends the muttering of the *madhuvātā* verses again for their times, is not found in all the recensions of Gobhila is approved by *Bhaṭṭabhāṣya* and others and is to be laughed at and rejected. This assailed reading of Gobhila is found on folio 15a of the P.B. The fifth quotation is on p. 185 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that the view of Śrīdatta, that the word *Kuśān* is to be interpreted as three *Kuśas* by the maxim of *kapiñjalādhikaraṇa*, is to be disapproved. This interpretation of the word *Kuśān* as *Kuśatrayam* (three *Kuśas*) is found on folio 15b of the P.B. The sixth quotation is on p. 310 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that Śrīdatta reads *pitrādri-traya-patnīstu* in place *pitrādi-traya-patnīṣu* in the text of Śaṅkha, cited just above. The reading, attributed to Śrīdatta, is found on folio 33a of the P.B., with the words *iti-śaṅkhavacanācca*, added just after the verse containing it. The seventh quotation is on p. 474 of the Śr. K.K. and is to the effect that the interpretation of *Pārijāta*, *Ratnākara*, Śrīdatta and others of the sentence '*tasyoktaḥ pārvaṇo vidhiḥ*', occurring in a text of Śaṅkha, consisting of two verses, is not approved of by our author. The interpretation consists in the restriction of the *pārvaṇa śrāddha* to that person only on whose death anniversary the *pārvaṇa* is being performed, owing to the singular number of the word *tasya* (meaning 'his'), occurring in the text of *Śaṅkha*, quoted above. The verses of *Śaṅkha* and the interpretation of Śrīdatta are found on folios 36b and 37a respectively of the P.B.

Vide Appendix (I) for the quotations.

(g) Food and drink in Mediaeval Bengal, as gathered from the works of Ballāla Sena and Govindānanda.

Of the five works of Ballāla Sena (1158-1179 A.D.), the twelfth century Hindu king of Bengal, only two viz. the *Dānasāgara* and *Adbhutasāgara* are extant and have been published (vide notes 50 and 51 above and note 156 below). Of these two, the

Dānasāgara is the more voluminous treatise, dealing in 75 chapters with 1375 kinds of gifts, relating to everything under the sun. Eleven only of these 75 chapters, viz. chapter 13 and chapters 16 to 25, are specifically concerned with food and drink, while sixteen other chapters, viz. chapter 37 and chapters 61-75, also incidentally describe gifts of the same (Vide Appendix to this section). The other published work, the *Adbhutasāgara*, dealing with śānti (or propitiation of the maleficent powers) as it does, contains no chapter on food and drink.

Govindānanda's *Varṣakriyākaumudī* is the biggest of his four published digests, as has been stated above but it does not contain a good many instances of the then prevalent food and drink, concerned is it is with the religious rites to be performed throughout the year. The three rites, which contain incidental references to food and drink, are the *pipītakī-dvādaśī-vrata*, *cāturmāsya-vrata* and *kojāgara*.[135] Of these, the first, which is to be celebrated for four consecutive years in the twelfth *tithi* of the bright half of the month of *Vaiśākha*, contains the injunction of making gifts of jars of scented cool water along with salt, sugared curds, sweets, rice, garlands and clothes (p. 252). The second rite, i.e. the *cāturmāsya-vrata*, is to be performed for the four months, beginning with *Āṣāḍha* and ending with *Āśvina*, when the god Hari is supposed to be sleeping. The performer of this rite should abstain from taking jaggery, oils, dressed betels, ghee, fruits, curds, milk, honey, meat and two kinds of *kalāya* pulses, blue and black (pp. 290-91). The third rite is to be performed on the full moon night of the month of *Āśvina*, which is called *kaumudī*, when one should keep awake and having put on a good attire, should worship with highly scented articles the goddess Lakṣmī and the king of gods, Indra, seated on the *airāvata* elephant and pass the night in playing dice. One should propitiate on that night the fathers and the gods and entertain friends with cocoanuts and flattened rice (cīpiṭaka) and himself partake of the cocoanut milk (pp. 453-54).

This author's *Dānakriyākaumudī* is nearly one-fourth in size of the *Dānasāgara* and though the former has been obviously copied from the latter, yet it nowhere mentions this earlier treatise on *dāna*.[136] Of articles of food and drink, the D.K.K. has specific

---

135. The word seems to be derived from the words viz. *Kojāgarti* (i.e. who remains awake), contained in the following verse of the *Liṅgapurāṇa*, quoted in the V.K.K. (p. 454) :—

niśīthe varadā lakṣmī (ḥ) ko jāgartīti bhāṣiṇī /
jagat prakramate tatra loka-cėṣṭāvalokinī /

136. That Govindānanda was aware of the existence of the *Dānasāgara* and similar other works on the same subject, containing detailed procedures of the sixteen *mahādānas* (i.e. great gifts such as the *Tulāpuruṣa*) and the *acaladānas* (i.e. gifts of heaps of paddy etc.) is evident from an extract on p. 86 of the D.K.K. (Vide note 69 above for the extract.) He therein refers the readers to the original treatises on *dāna* for the procedure of the above two highly expensive gifts and various other donations.

sections on the gift of water (pp. 44-46), of dressed betels (p. 47), of fruits (p. 49) and of paddy (p. 65). The remaining two works of this author, viz. the *Śrāddhakriyā-kaumudī* and *Śuddhikaumudī*, contain no information whatsoever of varieties of food and drink, prevalent at the time of their composition, concerned as they are with *śrāddha* and *śuddhi* (including *aśauca* and *malamāsa*) respectively.

Mr. Taponath Chakravorty has recently (24th March, 1959) published from Calcutta an excellent monograph viz. *Food and Drink in Ancient Bengal.* Though he has utilized the *Hāralatā* of Anirudha Bhaṭṭa a number of times and mentioned Raghunandana only once (p. 16) in the body of his work and has mentioned along with others the *Kṛtyaratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara, a digest-writer of Mithilā (modern North Bihar) in his Select Bibliography (p. 55), yet he has nowhere utilized this latter digest in the body of the work. The author, Mr. Chakravarty, says in the Appendix (p. 66) about Raghunandana, 'In his canonical work he deals with the kṛtyas or Kṛtyatattvas etc.' Here the addition of the word 'Kṛtyatattvas' is wrong, as *Kṛtyas* means 'religious actions guided by the customary rules and regulations' but Kṛtyatattva (and not *Kṛtyatattvas*) is the name of one of the 28 *Tattvas* (or works) of Raghunandana, published as the *Smṛtitattva* in 2 vols by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1895. The title of Chakravarty's monograph is also inccurate. It should be *Food and drink in Ancient Mediaeval Bengal* and not simply *Food and drink in Ancient Bengal,* as it has utilized the Smṛti digests of Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa and Raghunandana of the 12th and 16th centuries respectively, who thus belonged to the Mediaeval Period.[137] The author is also not correct in writing *Khecarānna* on p. 6 as the Sanskrit original of the Bengali word *Khicuri* (hodge-podge) and in connecting the Bengali word *bārui,* the name of a caste, on p. 23 with another Bengali word *baroja,* which means 'betel-leaf plantation.' The Sanskrit original of *Khicuri* is Kṛsarânna or Kṛśaranna[138] and the caste-name *bārui* is probably derived from the Sanskrit word vārijīvī (i. e. one who ekes out a living by a calling in connection with water).

Appendix

Dānasāgara			Food and drink
Chapter	13	...	gift of water :
,,	16	...	rice
,,	17	...	other eatables, such as cakes, fruits and esculent roots.

137. Vide *History of Dharmaśāstra,* vol. I, by MM. Dr. P. V. Kane.
138. *Kṛsara* or *Kṛśara* or *Kṛṣara* occurs in the D.S. (p, 629), quoting a Mahâbhārata text (*anuśāsanaparvan* 64/8), viz. *ārdrāyaṃ kṛśaraṃ dattvā* and explaining it as *tila-taṇḍula-miśra-dugdham* : Vide Apte's *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Revised edition of 1957), vol. I, p. 600, where *kṛsara* or *kṛśara* means 'rice and peas boiled together with a few spices (Marathi *khicḍi*).'

Dānasāgara		Food and drink
Chapter 18	...	salt.
„ 19	...	clarified butter.
„ 20	...	curds.
„ 21	...	milk.
„ 22	...	jaggery of sugarcane.
„ 23	...	highly scented cold drinks.
„ 24	...	fruits.
„ 25	...	honey.
„ 37	...	suggarcandy, jaggery, ghee, oil, salt, ginger, mustard, turmeric, pulses and other spices in the topic viz. 'gift of houses.'
„ 61	...	cakes, along with salt, ghee and jaggery.
„ 62	...	paddy, *mudga* pulses, ghee, vessels of milk, fruits, *pāyasa*[139] with ghee and honey, rice, cakes whey and salt.
„ 63	...	gift of cakes, jaggery, *paramānna*,[140] ghee and *akṣata* (i.e. sunboiled rice).
„ 64	...	...*akṣata* (on the *akṣaya-tritīyā* day), powdered wheat with jaggery, paddy, cooked rice and kṛṣara (i.e. a dish, made of milk, sesamum and rice).
„ 65	...	...rice and drink, vessels, filled with ghee along with gold.
„ 66	...	...pāyasa with ghee, milk, rice and drink, along with ghee and meat of unprohibited animals, *kṛśara*, cakes, products of milk, rice mixed with ghee and milk, *kālaśāka* with roots, fruits and esculent roots, curds, powdered barley, mixed with water, ghee and sugar, milk mixed with honey and ghee, kṛsara.
„ 67	...	...ghee, milk or any preparation from milk, such as curds, whey or ghee.
„ 68	...	gift of powdered barley, mixed with sugar and sugarcandy, salt, ghee, fruits and *harītaka* (or *patraśāka*) and paddy.
„ 69	...	cold drinks, eatables with astringent taste and rice, powdered barley with sugarcandy, salt, ghee and *harītaka*.
„ 70	...	barley and rice.

139 and 140. *pāyasa* and *paramānna* are synonymous and mean 'rice boiled in milk with sugar.'

Dānasāgara		Food and drink
Chapter 71	...	betels, fruits and esculent roots, scented drinks, *śākas*, jaggery, sugarcane juice, salt, vegetables, oil, *āmalaka*, honey, ghee, flour mixed with curds, various preparations of milk, solidified milk for licking, milk and mangoes for sucking, sugarcane, bunch of grapes, sweetmeats, delicious fruits and flour.
,, 72	...	fruits with seeds.
,, 73	...	paddy.
,, 74	...	fruits aad esculent roots, heaps of *śāli* rice.
,, 75	...	delicious *śākas*, along with ghee, sugar and mineral or non-marine salt.

VI. Raghunandana Bhattacharya (1520-1570 A. D.)

Consecration of temples in the 16th century

Though M. M. Dr. P. V. Kane has devoted chapter xxvi (pp. 889-916), covering 28 pages of his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. ii., to *pratṣṭhā* and *utsarga* and utilized in it the Devapratiṣṭhātattva and *Jalāśayotsargatattva* of Raghunandana, yet he has not subjected to similar treatment the *Maṭhapratiṣṭhāditattva* (MPT) of the same author, containing 20 pages (pp. 613-633), published in his *Smṛtitattva* vol. ii. The object of the present paper is to summarize the contents of the MPT to supply the deficiency of Dr. Kane's epoch-making work and to do so on the occasion of the reconstruction of one of the most historic Hindu temples of Bhāratavarṣa.[141]

The MPT consists of the following topics :—

(1) The building of palaces and similar other structures :

(2) The consecration of the same :

(3) Gifts on the above occasion to gods and specially to the god Viṣṇu :

(4) The *dakṣiṇā* and feeding of Brâhmaṇas

We take up the topics one by one :—

(1) The building etc. :—

Our author first quotes several authorities such as *Yama*, *Viṣṇu* and the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* to lay down the religious merit of consecrating temples, the purport of which is given below :—

A person becomes entitled (after death) to the world of that very god, whose temple is either consecrated or whose image is installed or systematic paintings concerning whom are done by him. The religious merit, accruing from constructing images of particular gods out of clay, wood, bricks and stone, is successively higher than that of the preceding one, in case of both the rich and the poor :

Our author then quotes *Chitragupta* for the merit of making a gift of land for the erection of a temple, which purports that the donor of land for construction of the house of a god becomes entitled to the world of that very god, who is going to be installed there. He then cites *Viṣṇu* to the effect that the renovator of wells and parks, tanks and temples derives the same religious merit as accrues to the constructor of the same. Then, after having cited various astrological authorities, laying down the proper time for the consecration of the images of several gods, our author says that the sacrifices to the nine planets and to the fifty-three deities, beginning from Brahman and ending with Aditi and presiding over houses and tanks, are absolutely necessary to be done, before one launches into a constructional enterprise of the same. The latter sacrifice, i.e. to the fifty-three

---

141. This paper was written in 1951 at the time of the construction of the new Somanâtha temple. For details of Raghunandana's other works, vide the present writer's monograph viz. 'Raghunandana's indebtedness to his predecessors.'

deities, mentioned above, is to be performed most preferably several days before the beginning of the actual construction or on the very day of the outset of the same or on the day of entrance into the same at the latest. The entrance doors in the four cardinal directions should be of the wood of *plakṣa udumbara, aśvattha* and *nyagrodha* in the east, south, west and north respectively and should be one cubit above the ground but four cubits in height. Raghunandana then lays down on the authority of the *Hayaśīrṣa* (*-pañcarātra*) that "the bamboo, to be used for the crest of the building, should be spotless, beautiful and strong, a fine wheel of copper should be placed over it and the bamboo itself should be as long as the building is broad. This bamboo, carrying the crest, should be fixed on the north-eastern and then on the north-western direction of the building. The crest should be beautifully made of either silk, cotton or linen and should be of one or two colours and bedecked with a bell and cowrie and set with a group of pendants and peacock feathers. A crest, which is one cubit in height from the surface to the end, is known as the great crest, is auspicious and fulfils all desires. All worship and oblation, performed by persons in a palace without a crest, become useless and conduce to nothing." Our author then says on the authority of the Śivasarvasva that "crests, marked with the figures of particular beasts of burden, are to be offered to particular gods (in particular temples). The figure of a horse is to be marked on the crest of a temple of the sun-god, that of an ox on that of the god Hara (i. e. Śiva), that of the divine bird Garuḍa on that of the god Viṣṇu, while the figure of a lion is to be imprinted on the crest of a temple of the goddess Durgā. All such crests are to be fitted out with banners and not otherwise."

(2) The consecration :—

Raghunandana now quotes the *samudāya-pratiṣṭhā-paṭala* from the *Saṅkarṣaṇakāṇḍa* of the *Hayaśīrṣa-pañca-rātra*, written in *dvikhaṇḍa* (?) characters and procured by Ballāla Sena Deva [the Bengal king (?) of the same name and author of the five digests, referred to above] to the following effect :—

'O you, the best among men ! just hear about the procedure of consecrating a pasture for cattle, a park, a bridge, a temple (*maṭha*), a difficult path made easily passable or a house and also that of finalizing abstinences, vows and hardships. After having placed the fire, according to the procedure, laid down in one's *gṛhyasūtra*, a wise man should place a stone (for mortar and pestle), a vessel, full of rice and bell-metal utensils (for fetching the fire). He should then begin to prepare the gruel of barley with milk of the dark-brown cow, after having collected all necessary things. After having sprinkled milk of the dark-brown cow with the muttering of the mystic syllable *Om* and ghee with the utterance of the mantra, beginning with the words *oṃ tadviṣṇoḥ*, the consecrator should mix the things together with a churning rod in the clock-wise fashion. After having finished the preparation and let it down, he should perform several *homas* successively with several mantras, such as *tad viṣṇoḥ* etc., *vyāhṛti* (i.e. *bhūr bhuvaḥ svaḥ*), *gāyatrī* and *tad viprāsa etc., viśvataścakṣuḥ* etc.and *somaṃ rājānam* and also to the guardian-deities of the ten directions and to the planets with mantras,

appropriate to them. After having thus performed the *homas*, he should offer portions of the gruel to the ten directions and again perform *homa* for one hundred and eight times with sticks of *palāśa* wood and then with ghee with the following mantras. The first *homa* is to be performed with the mantras of the *Puruṣa Sūkta* and that with ghee-besmeared sesame seeds is to be done with the mantra viz. *Irāvatī* etc. After having offered *homa* to the gods beginning with Brahman, Viṣṇu and Īśa (i.e. Śiva) with their attendants, to the planets, to the lords of the several worlds, to the mountains, rivers and seas with *vyāhṛti*, he should offer the full oblation thrice with *sruv* and with the *vaiṣṇava* mantra ending with *vauṣaṭ*. Then after having partaken of the five holy products of the cow, he should offer *dakṣiṇā* to the *ācārya* in the shape of a vessel of sesame with gold and a cow with clothes and ornaments on, with the mantra viz. *Prīyatāṃ bhagavān viṣṇuḥ* (i.e. Let the lord Viṣṇu be pleased). He, who gets a park constructed, lives for ever in the celestial garden and the donor of a temple (*maṭha*) dwells eternally in heaven. The gift of a bridge entitles a person residence in the world of Indra and that of a reservoir of water leads him undoubtedly to the world of Varuṇa. The constructor of a difficult passage goes over to heaven and that of a brick-built bridge always lives in paradise. The repairer of a pasture for cows dwells permanently in the world of cows. The practiser of abstinences and vows reaches (after death) the world of Viṣṇu, while the person, undergoing hardships, is cleared of all sins and gets everything desired. It is by this procedure that a mortal reaps the full spiritual benefit of his religious actions. I have thus told you in short the entire procedure, applicable to all the *varṇas* and productive of the fruits of all desires. The learned, who hanker after the good results of their actions, should perform this consecration in the appropriate manner and to the accompaniment of the appropriate Vedic hymns, inasmuch as a gift of the above things, unaccompanied with the procedure of consecration, conduces to no result.'

Our author interprets the term *maṭha*, occurring in the above quotation, as a temple and neither as a monastery nor as a residential college for pupils and teachers and adds here on the authoritity of a text of *Kātyāyana*, quoted in the *Vivādaratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara (p. 136 of B. I. ed. of 1931) that the inheritor of the property of a promisor of the construction of a temple and similar other things is bound to fulfil the promise of the previous owner by consecrating the same. The purport of the very text of *Kātyāyana* is to the following effect :—

'If a person, whether alright or indisposed, promises to donate something to the cause of *dharma* and dies before fulfiilling the promise, his son is bound to make a gift of the same—there is no doubt about it.'

(3) Gifts to gods :—

Our author quotes several purāṇas such as *Agni*, *Vāmana*, *Narasiṃha*, *Nandi* and *Viṣṇudharmottara* for recommending gifts to gods on the occasion of the consecration of temples. The quotation from the first is concerning the gift of gold, pearls and jewels

and similar other rare and precious things (which last, according to our author, include houses) to Keśava, the lord of the gods. The citation from the second is for recommending the gift of the pure and most desirable things of the house for the propitiation of the holder of discus (i.e. Viṣṇu), the god of gods. The extract from the third lays down that the giver of nine folds of the white or yellow sacred thread, made of silk, to Govinda (i.e. Viṣṇu), reaches the end of the Vedas (i.e. reaps the highest spiritual benefit). The three lines, cited from the fourth, state that he, who makes a gift of ornaments to a Brāhmaṇa or to a god or goddess, goes to the world of Varuṇa, being himself bedecked with various ornaments and becomes the lord of an island, in case he is reborn on the earth in course of time. The quotation from the fifth work, i.e. the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, is rather the longest and consists of some thirty verses (iii, 341), the first ten of which relate to gifts to gods in general and the succeeding twenty to those to Viṣṇu only.

The purport of the former group of verses is as follows :—

'After having ceremonially cleansed the soil in a holy spot or elsewhere, one should have an abode of gods (i.e. a temple) constructed in accordance with one's capacity and in conformity with the proper procedure. O best of the twice-born ! a person enjoys heaven for so many thousands of years as there are atoms in that abode of gods. O Brāhmaṇas ! I have already told you the religious merit, following the gift of (a building made of) straw or wood. The religious merits of making gifts of brick-built houses and stone-built mansions are ten and hundred times respectively of the above. Whatever is dedicated to a god by a morally exalted person, freed from the desire for results, leads the latter to a place, where he has no cause for grief. The worst persons, who are ignorant and desirous of results and trading, as it were, with *dharma*, worship the Lord of the world, derive, of course, the fulfilment of their desires but the fruits of the actions of those small-witted persons have got a definite end. O best among the twice-born ! the Lord receives with His feet the gifts, made to Him with a desire, but with His head all those given to Him without a desire. He, who makes a gift of a conveyance, bed, seat, umbrella, leather shoes, wooden shoes, a beast of burden, a cow or an effigy of *dharma* to the gods, reaps the religious merit of a *Vahniṣṭoma* (i.e. *Agniṣṭoma*) sacrifice from each of them.'

The latter group of verses eulogizes, with allurement of corresponding results to donors, the gifts of conch, bell, canopy, altar, unused pitcher, shoes, mirror, metals other than gold or silver, gold, servant, milch cow, bull, bed and seat, bed-cover, artistic articles necessary for a temple, musical instruments, dancing shows, conveyance, beast of burden, palanquin, umbrella, a stalk of palm-leaf, a cowrie, pots for garlands, incense and sandal-paste respectively, conch-shells, metallic pots, fragrant oils and other toilet requisites.

(4) The *dakṣiṇā* etc. : —

Our author next quotes the *Skandapurāṇa* from the *Dānaratnākara* (folio 64a, D.C. MS. No. 114 of 1884-86), the *Matsyasūkta*, the *Yoginītantra*, the *Devīpurāṇa* from the *Pūjāratnākara*, the *Rājamārtaṇḍa*, *Gobhila* *Jātūrkarṇa* from the *Dānaratnākara*

(folio 2a of the same MS.) with the comment of the later, *Bṛhaspati*, *Chandogapariśiṣṭa*, *Saṭtriṃśan-mata* from the *Mitākṣarā* (iii, 326), *Yogi-yājñavalkya* (vii, 33a and 35) *Vāmanapurāṇa* and *Yama*. The purport of the first two quotations is to the effect that all gifts, intended to be made over to gods, should be given to Brāhmaṇas with appropriate *dakṣiṇās*. The citation from the fourth is concerning the procedure of *nīrājana* (i.e. waving lights etc. before the deity) with grains, twigs, lamps and conches, while that from the fifth lays down the prescription of the performance of *vṛddhi-śrāddha* in the beginning of every consercration of a temple or entrance in a new house. The seventh quotation distinguishes between *iṣṭa* and *pūrta* and includes the consecration of temples and reservoirs of water in the latter. It concludes by saying that the members of the twice-born classes only are entitled to perform both *iṣṭa* and *pūrta* works, while the Śūdra is allowed to do the latter only and not the former, inasmuch as it includes the performance of *Agnihotra* and other sacrifices. The quotations from the *Yogi-yājñavalkya* and *Vāmanapurāṇa* recommend the muttering of the name and making obeisance to the god Nārāyaṇa while making ablution or any other ceremonial action. The citation from *Yama* lays down the necessity of making Brāhmaṇas utter the words *puṇyāha* (i.e. holy day) and *svasti* (i.e. let good befall you) at the outset of every religious enterprise. The quotation from the *Matsyapurāṇa*, with which our author concludes this work, is relating to the duty of feeding, after the consecration, one thousand, hundred and eight, fifty or twenty Brāhmaṇas, according to the consecrator's capacity.

VII. A few remarks on S. C. Banerji's 'Smṛti-nibandha Literature and Bengal's contribution'[142]

(I.H.Q., vol. xxv, i, pp. 38-51)

(I) Mr. S. C. Banerji, the author of the above paper says on p. 42 of the same, 'For example, the name of Raghunandana is familiar to many in Bengal. But there are few who ever care to understand the value of his contribution.' The present writer hereby informs Mr. Banerji that he has been working on Raghunandana for the last several years, that he has been appointed Sir William Jones Research Fellow in the Asiatic Society of Bengal with Raghunandana as his subject and that the following among his already published papers deal with one or other aspect of Raghunandana's contribution :—

(a) The place of Agastyasaṃhita in Dharmaśāstra Literature.[143]

(b) The Śuddhiratnākara : an unpublished Smṛti manuscript of Mithilā.[144]

---

142. This paper has been reproduced here from ABORI, vol. xxxi, Poona, 1951, as the author Mr. (now Dr.) Banerji has either persisted in his errors or not acknowledged indebtedness to the present writer in spite of his acceptance of the latter's views, in his recent Bengali monograph viz. *Smṛtiśāstre Bāṅgālī*, calcutta, 1961-62.

143. J.B.O.R.S., vol. xxii (1936), pp. 111-115. 144. *Ibid*, vol. xxiii (1937) pp. 138-142.

(c) Raghunandana's indebtedness to Caṇḍeśvara.[145]
(d) Hindu Pilgrimages of the 15th century.[146]
(e) Vidyāpati, a Maithila writer on Dharmaśāstra.[147]
(f) The devotional element in Raghunandana's works.[148]

(2) Following the statement in the preface to the *Hāralatā*, a work of Aniruddha, by the editor, the late M. M. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha, repeated by Mr. (now MM Dr.) P. V. Kane on p. 338 of his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. i, published in 1930, Mr. Banerji says on pp. 46 and 47 of his above paper, 'Anirudhha was an inhabitant of Vihārapaṭṭaka (or pāṭaka) on the bank of the Ganges.' This shows that he has consulted neither Mr. Prabhas Chandra Senvarman's Bengali article,[149] viz. mahopādhyāya śrīmad-anruddha bhaṭṭera vāsagrāma' (i. e. the village of residence of the great teacher Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa), nor the present writer's Bengali paper,[150] viz. 'Bāṅgālī Smārta' (i.e. Bengali writers of smṛtinibandhas). Mr. Senvarman has explained the word *paṭṭaka* as a village on the authority of Sanskrit lexicons and, having failed to discover the village of vihāra on the main stream of the Ganges and its branch, the Bhāgīrathī, has indentified it with the village of the same name on the karatoyā in the Bogra district in North Bengal (now East Pakistan), on the strength of his interpretation of the word *surāpagā* (lit. the river of the gods), occurring in the epithet of Aniruddha, viz. '*surāpagā-tīravihāra-paṭṭaka-nivāsinā*,[151] as any holy river and not necessarily the Ganges, on the analogy of the oft-quoted text of Manu (ii, 17), viz. *sarasvatī-dṛṣadvatyor-devanadyor yadantaram*', where the Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī are spoken of by Manu as *devanadī*-s (lit. rivers of the gods). The present writer has referred to and accepted this interpretation of Mr. Senvarman in his above paper.

(3) Following imperfectly[152] the opinion of Dr. Kane, as expounded on p. 339 of his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. i, Mr. Banerji says on p. 47 of his above paper, in connection with the line of Aniruddha, 'The lower limit is fixed by the mention of his works

145. N.I.A., vol. i (1938), pp. 534-5.
146. Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference, Ninth session, Trivandum (published 1940), pp. 415-420.
147. *Ibid*, Twelfth session, Benares (published 1946), pp. 288-297.
148. *Siddha-bhāratī*, (published by V. V. R. Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1950), Part I, pp. 225-229. (It may be added here that the present author's research work on Raghunandana has in the meantime been published in 1955 by the above Society in the shape of a monograph viz. *Raghunandana's indebtedness to his predecessors.*
149. Published in the *Bhāratavarṣa*, Kārtika, 1326 B.E. (=Oct.-Nov. 1919 A.D.)
150. Published in the Śrībhāratī, Agrahāyaṇa, 1345 B.E. (Nov.-Dec., 1938 A.D.)
151. Vide colophon of the *Hāralatā*, p. 214, *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1909.
152. Dr. Kane says on the same page of his above work, 'The *Hāralatā* is named as an authority in the *Śuddhiviveka* of Rudradhara' and assigns, on p. 397 of the same, the time between 1425 and 1460 A.D. as the period of Rudradhara's literary activity.

by Raghunandana and Govindânanda, whose date approximately falls between the end of the 15th century and the beginning of the 16th.' This conclusion is wrong. The present writer has proved in 1937 in his paper, viz. 'The Śuddhiratnākara : an unpublished Smṛti manuscript of Mithilā',[153] that the lower limit of Aniruddha's date is the beginning of the 14th century and his finding is based upon his identification of three quotations from the *Hāralatā* of Aniruddha in the *Śuddhiratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara, who flourished in the first half of the 14th century. Dr. S. K. De, the author of the chapter on Sanskrit Literature in the *History of Bengal,* vol. i., published in 1943,[154] has accepted the above view of the present writer and acknowledged his paper on pp. 352-3 of his above chapter. The concluding portion of the above-quoted sentence of Mr. Banerji is also inaccurate, as he writes 'whose date approximately falls... ' after 'Raghunandana and Govindānanda,' who were not exactly contemporaries but were separated by almost a generation.[155]

(4) Mr. Banerji mentions on the same page of his above paper the names of four works of Ballāla Sena, viz. *Dānasāgara, Adbhutasāgara, Ācārasāgara* and *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara.* As only the *Adbhutasāgara* has been fully published,[156] the *Dānasāgara* has been twice partly published[157] and its Mss. are also extant, none of which, viz. the partly printed editions and Mss., has, however, been consulted by Mr. Banerji and as the names of the *Ācārasāgara* and *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara* are known only from their mention in verses 56 and 55 of the *Dānasāgara,* so it seems that the above enumeration of the works of Ballāla Sena by Mr. Banerji is based on the authority of Dr. Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra,* vol i.[158] The above enumeration is, however, incorrect. The present writer has proved in 1945 in his paper viz. 'Caṇḍeśvara's indebtedness to Ballāla Sena,'[159] the existence of the *Vratasāgara,* a hitherto-unknown fifth work of Ballāla Sena, from two references to the same in the partly printed edition of the *Dānasāgara* by Pandit Śyāmācaraṇa Kaviratna. Dr. R. C. Majumdar, the general editor and Bengali translator of the *History of Bengal* vol. i, has incorporated the name of the *Vratasāgara* on p. 130 and acknowledged indebtedness to the present writer on p. 2 (of the preface) of the second edition of the Bengali translation of his above work, published[160] in 1949.

153. J. B. O. R. S., vol. xxiii, pp. 138-142.

154. By the Dacca University.

155. Vide pp. i-iii of the preface to the *Varṣakriyākaumudī* of Govindānanda, edited by MM. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha, *Bibliotheca Indica,* 1902.

156. Edited by Muralīdhar Jhā, Prabhakari and Co., Benares, 1905.

157. Edited by Śyāmācaraṇa Kaviratna (Calcutta, 1914-19) with Bengali translation. It covers pp. 1-16 and pp. 1-316 and comprises one-fifth portion only of the whole work up to *pañcalāṅgalakamahādāna.* Another shorter edition (pp. 1-3, 1-80 up to a certain portion of *dānāpavāda*) in Bengali characters with Bengali translation was also published in the *Sāhitya-saṃhitā,* a Bengali journal of Calcutta. Its title-page is missing in my copy.

158. Vide p. 340 of the same.

159. *Indian Culture,* vol. xi, pp. 141-144.

160. By General Printer and publishers Ltd., Calcutta.

(5) Mr. Banerji further says on the same page of his above paper, 'The *Dānasāgara* is believed to have been left unfinished by Ballāla Sena and completed by his son, Lakṣmaṇa Sena.' This is absolutely wrong. This remark applies to the *Adbhutasāgara*, which is the last and unfinished work of Ballāla Sena, not to the *Dānasāgara*, which was composed by him in 1091 *śaka* (=1169-70 A. D.), as recorded by our author in the body of the work, extant in the R. A. S. B. (No. i. A. 73)[161] and I.O. (Nos. 719-720/1704-5)[162] Mss. of the same. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. i, p. 341 and *History of Bengal*, vol. i., p. 354, attest the above statement.

(6) Mr. Banerji further says in foot-note 24 of the above page of his paper, in connection with the *Dānasāgara*, 'It still exists in Mss.' This is also inaccurate. Two partly printed editions of this work have already been described in footnote 157 above. The present writer consulted and referred to edition by Paṇḍita Śyāmācaraṇa Kaviratna in his paper, viz. 'Caṇḍeśvara's indebteduess to Ballāla Sena,' referred to above. It may also be added here that the present writer has been appointed editor of the *Dānasāgara* by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in September, 1947 and has by this time completed the preparation of the press-copy for publication in the *Bibliotheca Indica* in collation of the above-mentioned three Mss. of the same and the work is now passing through the press, 24 pages having already been printed off.[163]

(7) Mr. Banerji mentions on p. 48 of his above paper eight treatises only as the genuine works of Śūlapāṇi and omits from his list the *Śrāddhaviveka*,[164] *Prāyaścittaviveka*[165] and *Dīpakalikā*,[166] the three bigger and more important published works of the same author. It is rather strange that though the first two works, which are *nibandha*-s, are studied in indigenous Sanskrit Colleges and held authoritative in Hindu religious matters in Bengal even to this day and the third work is a learned commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, all the above three works having been profusely quoted as of Śūlapāṇi by Raghunandana in his various works and though Mr. Banerji himself has referred to the *Prāyaścittaviveka* in footnote 32 of p. 51 of his above paper, yet he excludes them from his list of the genuine works of Śūlapāṇi.

(8) Mr. Banerji says on p. 51 of his above paper, 'Govindānanda, styled *Kavikaṅkaṇācārya*, is placed, not on very conclusive evidence, by M. Chakravarti about the middle of the 16th century. The mention of the word *varṣakṛtya* by Raghunandana has led some scholars to think that Govindānanda was anterior to Raghunandana, but

161. Vide folio 221b (in the body of the work).

162. Vide folio 278b (in the body of the work) and also folio 309b (in the colophon).

163. The work has in the meantime been completely published in four fascicles between 1953-56 as work no. 274 of the *Bibliotheca Indica*.

164. Edited by MM. Caṇḍīcaraṇa Smṛtibhūṣaṇa in Bengali characters, Calcutta, 1314 B.E. (=1907-8 A.D.)

165. Edited with the commentary of Govindānanda by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1893.

166. Edited by J. R. Gharpure, Poona, 1939.

the word is taken by some to mean 'rites to be performed in the year' rather than the *Varṣakriyākaumudī* of Gobindānanda.' The late MM. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha, who discovered and edited the four works of Gobindānanda, viz. *Varṣakriyākaumudī, Dānakriyākaumudī, Śrāddhakriyākaumudī* and *Śuddhikaumudī* between 1902 and 1905, appended long and illuminating prefaces to his above editions and assigned in them 1510 to 1540 A. D. (i.e. the first half of the 16th century) as the period of the literary activity of Gobindānanda. So neither the credit of establishing the date[167] of Gobindānanda goes to M. Chakravarti nor is his assignment of the middle of the 16th century based on inconclusive evidence. The equation[168] of *Varṣakṛtya* with the *Varṣakriyākaumudī* by the learned editor, MM. Smṛtitīrtha, followed by Dr. Kane,[169] is wrong, inasmuch as the quotations in the *Malamāsatattva* of Raghunandana, following the word *Varṣakṛtye*, are not found in the *Varṣakriyākaumudī*. The word *varṣakrtya* does not also mean 'rites to be performed in the year,' as suggested by Mr. Banerji. It means the work of the same name by Vidyāpati, the famous Maithila poet and dharmaśāstra writer,[170] as Raghunandana expressly says *Vidyāpati-kṛta-varṣakṛtye* in introducing one[171] of those quotations in his *Malamāsatattva*.

(9) Though Mr. Banerji, while enumerating the works of Aniruddha and Gobindānanda on pp. 46 and 50 respectively of his above paper, refers to the five works, viz. the Hāralatā, Varṣakriyākaumudī, Dānakriyākaumudī, Śrāddhakriyākaumudī and Śuddhikaumudī as published in the Bibliotheca Indica, yet he nowhere mentions the name of their learned editor, the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha. But he does otherwise in the case of works, edited by other scholars. The present writer simply requests him to go through the preface to the *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. iii,[172] by MM. Dr. P. V. Kane, to be convinced of the quantity and quality of the work of MM Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha, the foremost dharmaśāstra editor of the past half-century and fit to be ranked only with the late MM Dr. Ganapati Shastri, the reputed resuscitator of Bhāsa's works.

---

167. Vide Dr. R. C. Hazra's recent and excellent paper on 'Govindānanda Kavikaṅkaṇ-ācārya' in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras (1951), vol. xviii, part ii, pp. 97-108 for almost confirmation of Smṛtitīrtha's date of Govindānanda.
168. Vide p. ii of the preface to the V.K.K.
169. Vide p. 415 of the *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. i.
170. Vide the present writer's paper viz. 'Vidyāpati, a Maithila writer on dharmaśāstra (Proc. 12th All-India Oriental Conference, pp. 288-297) for a detailed description of Vidyāpati's activities as a Dharmaśāstra writer.
171. On p. 823 (in Smṛtitattva, vol. i), edited by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1895. The two other quotations are on pp. 776 and 822 of the some work.
172. Published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Ponna, 1946.

Appendix of the Quotations

APPENDIX (A)

Identity of quotations in the Tīrthakāṇḍa (T.K.) of Kṛtyakalpataru and the Tīrthacintāmaṇi (T.C.)

Abbreviations : B.P.=Brahmapurāṇa, L.P.=Liṅgapurāṇa, M. bh=Mahābhārata M.P.=Matsyapurāṇa, Narasiṃha P.=Narasiṃhapurāṇa, S.P.=Skandapurāṇa Vāyu P.=Vāyupurāṇa, Vāmana P.=Vāmanapurāṇa, Yāj=Yājñavalkyasmṛti

(a) Gayā chapter

T.C. T.K.	
1. pp. 272-3=pp. 166-7 :	'Kriyate...gatāḥ' // (2 lines from B.P. and 14 lines from Vāmana P.)
2. p. 274=pp. 167-8 :	'ānantyāya...uddharet' // (4 lines from Vāyu P. and 6 lines from Bṛhaspati.)
3. pp. 274-5=pp. 168-9 :	'gayāyāṃ...kṛtsnaśaḥ // (22 lines from Vāyu P.)
4. pp. 277-88=pp. 171-4 :	'pūrvam prācīdiśaṃ...putriṇaḥ' // (27 lines from M. bh., 3 lines from Vāmana P., 2 lines from Narasiṃha P., 2 lines from M.P., 3 lines from Yāj., 3 lines from Yama and 2 lines from Vaśiṣṭha. The first line of Yāj is I. 261a.)

(b) Vārāṇasī chapter

T.C. T.K.	
1. p. 339=p. 12 :	'Vārāṇasī...sarvadā' // (6 lines from M.P.)
2. „ =p. 39 :	'Brahmaghna...lokaḥ' // (4 lines from S.P.)
3. „ =p. 38 :	'Kṣetraṃ...padaṃ saḥ' // (2 lines from S.P.)
4. p. 340= „ :	'Kṣetre' smin...mokṣaṃ padaṃ' // (4 lines from S.P.)
5. „ =p. 39 :	'dviyojana... antike' // (4 lines from M.P.)
6. p. 340 and p. 343=p. 30 :	'varaṇā...viśeṣataḥ' // (2 lines from B.P.)
7. p. 340=p. 31 and p. 39 :	'pañcakrośa...mayā tava' / (1 line from B,P.)
8. „ =p. 40 :	'catuḥkrośam...mṛtapradam' // (2 lines from S.P.)
9. p. 341=pp. 34-5 :	'piṅgalā...prakīrtitam' // (6 lines from L.P.)
10. p. 342=p. 13 :	'Vimuktam[1]...mahat smṛtam' // (3 lines from M.P.)
11. „ =p. 26 :	'nānāvarṇā...vidur budhāḥ' // (3 lines from M.P.)
12. „ =p. 31 :	'kṣetra...divi' // (8 lines from B.P.)
13. p. 343=p. 17 :	'brahmahā...nivartate' // (2 lines from L.P.)
14. „ =p. 19 :	'avimuktaṃ...bhavanti te' (2 lines from L.P.)
15. „ =p. 23 :	'ajñāj...bhavet' // (3 lines from L.P.)
16. pp. 344-5=p. 16 :	'yas tatra...śaṅkarasya tu' // (8 lines from L.P.)
17. p. 345= p. 16 :	'ādeha...makhair bhavet' // (2 lines from L.P.)
18. „ =p. 17 :	'ādeha...nivartate' // (2 lines from L.P.)
19. „ =p. 18 :	'Vighnair...aśāśvatam // (2 lines from M.P.)
20. p. 346=pp. 14-15 :	'viṣayā...punarviśet' // (2 lines from B.P.)
21. „ =p. 15 :	'janmāntara...gacchati' // (2 lines from B.P.)

1. Misprinted as viyuktam, p. 299, Appendix G. T.K.

T.C. T.K.	
22. ,, = ,, :	'brāhmaṇāḥ...mānaṇāḥ' // (6 lines from B.P.)
23. ,, =p. 16 :	'akāmo...mahīyate' // (2 lines from B.P.)
24. p. 347=p. 13 :	'manmanā...kvacit' // (2 lines from B.P.)
25. ,, =p. 21 :	'agni...śatair api' // (4 lines from B.P.)
26. ,, =p. 17 :	'avimukte...prayacchati' // (2 lines from B.P.)
27. ,, = ,, :	'antakāle...jāyate' // (2 lines from L.P.)
28. p. 348=p. 22 :	'jñāna-vijñāna[2]...nṛṇāṃ svarṇāle tu mṛtasya sā' // (2 lines from L.P.)
29. p. 349=p. 21 :	'daśānām...niścitam // (6 lines from M.P.)
30. ,, =pp. 31-2 :	'tatra dīpa[3]...saṃśayaḥ' // (5 lines from B.P.)
31. p. 350=p. 32 :	'kimatra...labhet' // (2 lines from B.P.)
32. ,, =pp. 21-2 :	'arcayedatha...gītavādite // (7 lines from B.P.)
33. p. 351=p. 29 :	'avimukte...bhavasannidhau' // (5 lines from M.P. according to T.K. but without the name of a Purāṇa in T.C.)
34. pp. 354-5=pp. 82-4 :	'darśanāddeva...māmakaṃ padam' // (35 lines from M.P.)
35. p. 356=p. 91 :	'daṇḍakhāte...bhavet' // (4 lines from L.P.)
36. pp. 356-7=pp. 95-6 :	'ye ca tvāṃ...durlabham' // (20 lines from L.P.)
37. pp. 358-9=pp. 108-110 :	'anyad...bhavet' // (31 lines from L.P.)
38. pp. 359-60=pp. 111-2 :	'avimuktasya...mocanam' // (7 lines from L.P.)
39. pp. 361-65=pp. 124-9 :	'ataḥparam...sthitaḥ sadā' // (87 lines from S.P.)
40. pp. 365-8=pp. 131-5 :	'tato' ham...duḥkhasāgare' // (63 lines from S.P.)

Appendix (B)

Quotations from D.S. in K.R.

K.R. D.S.	
1. p. 46=p. 52 :	'śaktāśakta...Harivaṃśe tathaivokter' iti Sāgaraḥ /
2. p. 50=p. 56 :	'anuharaṇe pāṭhe...ātmapraśaṃsāyāñc'eti Sāgaraḥ /
3. p. 51=pp. 56-7 :	Yathā ca Yogi-yājñavalkyaḥ-'Yadi...śrutiḥ // iti Sāgaraḥ /
4. p. 54=p. 58 :	'Sāvitrījapañca...nārāyaṇa-smaraṇam' iti [Dānasāgaraḥ]
5. pp. 56-7=p. 59 :	Dānasāgare tu 'upavāseneti...Vratasāgarīya...dhāvanādi-niṣedhād' ityuktam, tanna /
6. p. 61=p. 61 :	'aśvattha-nyagrodhaḥ...aśvatthasya punarupādānad' iti Sāgaraḥ /
7. p. 152=p. 506 :	'Puruṣāyato...sannihitatvāt' / Dānasāgare tv'avibhava-pakṣe' anyenāpi taijasena pratimā Kāry'eti likhitam /

2. T.K. reads 'jñāne vihita...sadbhiḥ sāvimukte mṛtasya tu //
3. T.C. reads 'yaś cāṅkitvā' for 'yaś cāṅkicā', read by T.K. (p. 32) with a query in the 4th line of the above quot.

K.R. D.S.	
8. p. 165=p. 604	'Svasti vâcayed iti...etanmadhutilair eva...tataḥ śrâddham' iti Dânasâgaraḥ / 'Etat tu dânaṃ brâhmaṇa-Kṣatriyakartṛkam eva'...Sâgaro' pyevam /
9. p. 169=p. 519 :	Matsyapurāṇe tathānyeṣvapi...pāṭho dṛṣṭaḥ tena Dānasāgarasya 'rukmadantam' iti pāṭha upekṣitaḥ /
10. p. 170=p. 521 :	'Ūrddhvapâda...tathâśruter' iti Dānasāgaraḥ /
11. pp. 170-171=pp. 521-2 :	Dānasâgare-'atrâgrapâda...nâbhika-tvam' ityuktam / ... 'khure...deyanītyarthaḥ / evam kṛtvâ deyanītyarthaḥ' /
12. p. 172=p.523 :	Atra Dānasâgare-'āpyāyatam...bhavant-ī'ti vyākhyātam /
13. p. 196=p. 574	Dânasâgare tu...'navakambalānic'eti paṭhitvâ 'nūtanakambalânīti vyâkhyātam / (D.S. reads 'navakambalakâni' and 'nūtanakambalâḥ')
14. p. 300=p. 625 :	'tadyuktâyâṃ...nakṣatrayuktâyām' Dânasâgara-Pārijatâvapyevam /
15. p. 404=p. 645 :	'atra kṛṣṇapratipadâdi...dīpadānam' iti Dânasâgaraḥ /
16 „ =p. 644 :	'atra Saura-Kârttika...dīpadānam' iti Dānasâgaraḥ / 'aparadineṣvapi...dīpadānam' ityuktam /
17. p. 407=p. 645 :	'atra paurṇamâsyantu...phalabhūyastvānmâsavyâpidânatvam' iti Dānasāgaraḥ /
18. p. 409=cf. p. 591 :	Yamaḥ :— ...maghâsu navame tithau / ...yastvatra vâkye 'maghâsu samaye' iti Dânasâgare pâṭhaḥ...samyag-anvayavirahāccâbalaḥ / (D.S. reads 'māghasya navamītithau' and not 'maghâsu samaye,' as recorded in K.R. as the reading of the former.)
19. p. 438=p. 617	'atra viśeṣataḥ iti darśanād...phalam'...iti Sāgaraḥ /
20. p. 443=cf. p. 577 :	'Aśvataro veśara iti prasiddhaḥ / Yugī Yuktaraya' iti Dânasâgaraḥ / (D.S. reads 'aśvataro x iti prasiddhaḥ' only)
21. p. 487=p. 571 :	'Idhmam...ādiśabdena...parigṛhītā' iti Dānasāgaraḥ /
22. „ = „ :	'Yiladhenuḥ...dey'eti Dānasāgaraḥ /
23. p. 515=p. 572 :	Dānasāgare 'Phâlgune...Kṛṣṇājinādikam' iti paṭhitvâ... vyākhyātam / ...tena Sāgara-paṭho manâk sabalaḥ /
24. p. 520=p. 627 :	Atra Karmaṇi...Sāgarânusārācca / Śravaṇa-yoga-vyatireke...jñeyam/
25. pp. 561-2=p. 662 :	Bhavatīti śeṣaḥ / ...etadubhayam arpaṇamâtram iti Dânasâgaraḥ /
26. p. 562=cf. p. 663 :	'uṣṇīṣaṃ purohita-mukuṭikṛtavâso-vinyāsarūpam' iti Dânasāgaraḥ / (D.S. reads 'uṣṇīṣaṃ rohita-mukutākri o')
27. pp. 563-4=p. 666 :	'mṛttikā tīrthamṛttikā...utsarge tu dakṣiṇādhikyât phalādhikyam iti' Dānasāgaraḥ /
28. p. 564=p. 667 :	'Krīḍanakaṃ...tyāgamātram' iti Dānasâgaraḥ /

K.R. D.S.	
29. „ = „ :	Atra Sāgare 'ādiśabdena śuktigrahaṇam' ityuktam /
30. p. 565=p. 669 :	Atra 'lohapadam...kāṃsyaparam' iti Sāgaraḥ / 'ārakūṭam...pittalam' /
31. p. 567=p. 674 :	'Yānaṃ ratham...hastyādī'ti Sāgaraḥ /
32. p. 573=p. 693 :	'vakṣyamāṇa-garuḍadhvaja...dhvajasya grahaṇam atre'iti Sāgaraḥ /
33. p. 575=cf. p. 698 :	'atra phalabhūmnā...Kumbhāgrāhyā' iti Sāgaraḥ /
34. p. 576=cf. p. 698 :	'vāridhāni vāsamī'ti Sāgaraḥ / (D.S. reads 'o vāsaneti prasiddhā' and contains a variant 'vāmaniti' for 'vāsaneti')
35. p. 578=cf. p. 702 :	'nānābhakti...svatantrānām eva dānam' iti Sāgaraḥ /
36. p. 579=p. 705 :	'sarvataḥ śrutiṃ sarvaśāstraśravaṇam' iti Sagaraḥ /
37. p. 592=cf. p. 583 :	'Kulmāṣaḥ paścimadeśe...Kulattha iti prasiddho vrīhiviśeṣa' iti Sāgaraḥ / (D.S. reads 'Kunmāṣasya' in the V.D. text, just above and explains it as 'Kunmaṣo rājamaṣaḥ and has got a variant for the second word as 'paścimadeśe rājamāṣa-prasiddho vrīhiviśeṣaḥ)
38. pp. 592-3=p. 583 :	'snānasya...sugandhāś...sitā...paramānnaṃ...dānam sarvatrānuṣaṅgo bodhavyaḥ' / (The above quotation, consisting of five explanatory sentences of the five words noted above, and occurring in a preceding text, is also taken *verbatim* from D.S., though without acknowledgement.)

Appendix (C)

Quotations from S.P. in K.R.

K.R. S.P.

1. p. 233=folio 36a : Atra ca kalpe Samayapradīpe prathamaślokamātraṃ likhitvā tikta-kaṭu-kaṣāya-madhurāṇāṃ krameṇa bhakṣaṇam ācarantītyuktam /
2. p. 400=folio 9b : Samayapradīpe-prathamaṃ yavās tadalābhe māṣa-kodrava-canaka-sarṣapa-masūra-cīna-kapitthavarjam anyad apyannaṃ saindhavaṃ mānasa-sambhavaṃ lavanaṃ tattu sāmbhari iti prasiddham iti /
3. p. 401=folio 17b : Samayapradīpe atra śloke 'nityasnāyī'ti pāṭho likhitaḥ, 'nityasnānaṃ' 'prātaḥsnānam' iti vyākhyātaṃ nityasnānaṃ prātaḥsnānam iti Śaṅkhokthe iti hetur uktaḥ /
4. p. 479=folio 47a : Samayapradīpastu Chandoga-Vājasenayoḥ sva-gṛhyanusārād apūpaḥ kaṭhanantu śākamiti vyāvasthā / Yasya tu svagṛhyādau viśeṣāśravaṇam tasya tulyavad vikalpa evetyāha /
5. p. 505=folio 16b : Yaditikartavyatā 'māghamāse tu yo Brahman' ityādibhir agrimavākyaiḥ pratipādyata iti Samayapradīpaḥ /

K.R. S.P.

6. pp. 509-510=folios 47b-48a : Brahmapurāṇe 'Śuklāyāṃ māghasaptamyāṃ...namaste sūryamaṇḍale // Iti mantreṇārghyaṃ dadyāt / Yathāṣṭamyāṃ devāditarpaṇaṃ vidhāya Bhīṣmāya jaladānam / tacca daivavidhinā /

'Vaiyāghrapadyagotrāya saṅkṛtipravarāya ca /
aputrāya jalaṃ dadyān namaste Bhīṣmavarmaṇe //

iti mantreṇa / etasya Gauḍasmṛtir ācāro vā prāpakaṃ pramāṇaṃ iti / tadbalāt sarvavarṇaviṣayatā / asavarṇajaladānaniṣedhastu prakaraṇādapi bhrātrādiviṣaya iti Samayapradīpaḥ /

7. p. 522=folio 49b : Samayapradīpe Garuḍo'gnir varunstatheti pāṭhaḥ / Sa ca kṛtyasamuccaya-kalpataru prabhṛtipāṭhaviruddhaḥ / (But the MS. of the S.P. reads 'Rudro'gnir varuṇastathā, while K.R. reads 'Rudro'gnir brāhmṇastathā.')

8. p. 540=folio 50b : Atra ca—

Tilodvartī tilasnāyī sucir nityam tiḷodakī /
hotā dātā ca bhoktā ca ṣattilī nāvasīdati //

iti sāmānyavacanam nityapadāñjasyam ullaṅghya janmadine yojayantīti Samayapradīpaḥ /

9. p. 633=folio 3a : Samayapradīpakāraiḥ svakartavyaviṣayo niyataḥ saṅkalpo vratam ityuktam /

10. p. 637=folios 6b-7a : 'Samayapradīpe'pīdam ubhayadinatithidvayabhede etad boddhavyam iti nāvatāritam / Kintu sāmānyata eva /

Appendix (D)

Text of the supplementary portion of the Gṛhastha-ratnākara-viṣṇuḥ :—

Bhāryā putraśca bandhuśca saṃsṛṣṭaḥ pāpakarmabhiḥ /
paribhāvya parityājyaḥ[4] patito'pi tathaiva ca //

paribhāvya doṣam utpādya /

Gautamaḥ (21/12-16) :—

Ajñānādhyāpanād ṛtvigācaryau patanīyasevāyām ca heyam / anyatra hānāt patati / tasya ca pratigrahītetyeke / na karhicinmātāpitror avṛttiḥ / dāyam tu labheran / ṛtvigācāryau ca yājakādhyāpakau na heyau /

'Ajñānādhyāpanād' ityatra naño jñāne'dhyāpane cobhayatrāpyanvayaḥ / jñānavirahaśca karmaviśeṣārtijye ca bodhyate / 'Avṛttir' anuvṛttiśūnyaḥ / 'dāyam tu labheran' putrā iti śeṣaḥ /

Āpastambaḥ (1/28/6-10) :—

Na patitam ācāryaṃ jñātim vā darśanārthī gacchet / na cāsmād bhogān upayuñjita /

---

4. Corrected from the reading and comment of the D.C. MS. The printed edition reads 'paribhāṣyo parityājyaḥ'.

yadṛcchayā sannipāte upasaṃgṛhya tūṣṇīm vyativrajet / mātā putratvasya bhūyāṃsi karmāṇyārabhate tasyāṃ śuśrūṣā nityā patitāyāmapi / na tu dharmasannivāpaḥ syāt /

'Darśanārthī'[5] Darśanam arthaḥ prayojanaṃ yasya / 'putratvasy'eti[6] putrasya āhitagarbhasya siddhyartham / 'dharmasannikāpaḥ' dharmakṛtye śrāddhādau modanam /

Āpastambaḥ (1/21/5-6) :—

Na patitaiḥ saṃvyavahāro vidyate / tathāpapātraiḥ / 'Apapātraiḥ' apavitrabhājanaiḥ /

Vaśiṣṭhaḥ (13/47) :—

Patitaḥ pitā parityājyaḥ / na mātā putraṃ pati[7] patati / Baudhāyanaḥ (2/2/42-43) :—

Na patitaiḥ saha[8] saṃvyavahāro vidyate / patitam api tu mātaraṃ vibhṛyād anabhibhāṣamāṇaḥ[9] /

Iti Gṛhastharatnākare tyājyātyājya-taraṅgaḥ /

Atha ṛṇāpakaraṇam /

Tatra Baudhāyanaḥ (2/9/1-14) .—

Prajākamāsyopadeśaḥ / Prajananañimittā samākhyetyaśvināvūcatuḥ /

Āyuṣā tapasā yuktaḥ svādhy yejyāparāyaṇaḥ /
Prajām utpādayet yuktaḥ sve sve vaṃśe jitendriyaḥ //
Brāhmaṇasyarṇasaṃyogas tribhir bhavati janmataḥ /
Tāni mucyātmavān bhavati vimukto dharmasaṃśayāt //
Svādhyāyena ṛṣin pūjya somena ca purandaram /
Prajayā ca pitṛn pūrvān anṛṇo divi modate //

Tathā vijñāyate / jāyamāno hi Brāhmaṇas tribhiḥ ṛṇavān jāyate / Brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhyaḥ, yajñena devebyaḥ, prajayā pitṛbhyaḥ / evam ṛṇasaṃyogaṃ vedo darśayati / xxx tatputram utpādyātmānaṃ tarayati /

Saptāvarān sapta pūrvān saḍanyān ātmasaptamān /
Satputram adhigacchaṃśca tārayatyenaso bhayāt //

Tasmāt prajāsantānam utpādya phalamāpnoti / tasmāt prajām utpādayet ātmanaḥ phalalābhāya / Yastu (?) Yasmāt putraṃ votpādyātmānaṁ evopapādayet / evaṃ vijñāyate, ātmā vai putranāmāsiti / evam dvitīya ātmā jīvatā draṣṭavyo Yaḥ putram utpānayati tasmān nātmā kvacid akṣetre samutsraṣṭavyaḥ / xxx tasmād ucitam eva kṣetram anviṣyate / savarṇe saṃskṛtavyapadeśena tasmād dārasaṃyoge[10] / prajām utpādayed auṣadhamantrayogena / tasyopadeśaḥ śrutisāmānyenopadiśyate / sarvavarṇebhyaḥ phalavattvād iti[11] /

'Prajākāmasyopadeśo' vidhīyat iti śeṣaḥ / 'Prajananaṃ' putrotpattiḥ, 'samākhyā' kulakīrtanaṃ / 'āyuṣā' āyurhetudīrgha-sandhyopāsana-brāhmaṇapara-dānādikarmaṇā[12],

5. Supplied from conjecture. 6. Supplied from conjecture.
7. The printed edition of V.D.S. reads 'mātā tu putreṇa'.
8. The (Mysore) printed edition of B.D.S. omits 'Saha'.
9. Corrected from the above. The D.C. MS. reads 'vibhṛyād abhibhāṣamāṇaḥ'.
10. Omitted in the printed editions of Baudhāyana. 11. Corrected from B.D.S.
12. Corrected from conjecture. The D.C. M.S. reads'° 'paradānādikarmaṇyadyapamāniyamena', which is meaningless.

'svādhyāyo' vedādhyayanam, 'ijya' yāgaḥ / 'yukto' Yatnavān, 'jitendriyaḥ' paradāreṣu maithunavarjī, svadareṣvapi niṣiddhakāle maithunavarjī / 'ātmavān' ātmatattvajñaḥ / 'dharmasaṃśayaḥ' satputrotpādanarūpo dharmo bodhyaḥ / xxx 'akṣetre' paradārādye / 'savarṇe' samānajātau / 'autsargikī' vedavidhānādina saṃskṛtasya putrotpādanasyopadeśaśrutiḥ / 'anṣadhamantrayogena' auṣadhaprayogeṇa mantrayogāt / 'Śrutisāmānyena upadiśyate' Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇe paṭhyata ityarthaḥ / 'phalavattvāt'[13] auṣadhamantraphalavattvāt /

Viṣṇuvaśiṣṭhau (=Viṣṇu 15/45=Vaśiṣṭha 17/1) :—

Ṛṇam asmin saṃnayati amṛtatvam ca gacchati /
Pitā putrasya jātasya paśyeccejjīvato mukham[14] //

asya 'jātasya' ṛṇapākaraṇayogyasyeti Bhatṛyajñaḥ / 'saṃnayatī'tyākrāmayati /

Saṅkhalikhitau :—

Jivat-putramukhaṃ dṛṣṭvā pitṛṇānanṛṇaḥ svargī /
Sa tena jātena tasmin saṃnyaśyati hyṛṇam //
Yatra kvacana[15] jātena pitā putreṇa nandati /
Tena cānṛṇatāṃ yāti pitṛṇāṃ piṇḍadena vai //

'Yatra kvacana' bījikṣetriṇor anyonyasamayapūrvakaṃ parakṣetre' pi /

Hāritaḥ :—

Yasya putraḥ śucir dakṣaḥ pūrve vayasi dhārmikaḥ /
Niyantā cātmadoṣaṇām sa tārayati pūrvajān //

Tathā :—

Puṃnāma nirayaḥ proktaḥ chinnatantuśca naireyaḥ /
Tato vai trāyate yasmāt tasmāt putra iti smṛtaḥ /

'Naireyo' nirayagāmī /

Tathā (=Viṣṇu 15/=Vaśiṣṭha 17/5) :—

Putreṇa lokān jayati pautreṇānantyam aśnute /
Atha putrasya pautreṇa bradhnasyāpnoti piṣṭapam[16] //

Śaṅkhalikhitau :—

Agnihotraṃ trayo vedā yajñaś ca bahudakṣiṇāh /
Jyeṣṭhaputraprasūtasya kalām nārhanti ṣoḍaśim //
Putra-pautra-pratiṣṭhasya bahuputrasya jīvataḥ /
Akṣuṇṇavedayajñasya hastaprāpyaṃ tripistam[17] //

---

13. Supplied from conjecture. The D.C. M.S. omits it.
14. V.R. quotes this as from Manu and Vaśiṣṭha.
15. The D.C. MS. reads 'yasmāt putreṇa°'.
16. V.R. quotes this as from Śaṅkalikhita, Viṣṇu, Vaśiṣṭha and Hārita.
17. Corrected from V. R. The D.C. MS. reads :—

Putrapautrapraviṣṭasya baddhapatyajīvataḥ /
Aṛṇvedayajñasya hastaprāpyaṃ triviṣṭapam //

'Jyeṣṭhaputraprasūtasya' prathamaṃ putraprasūtasya / Atra santānavardhanaṃ putraprayuktaṃ pitṛkarmaṇi / 'deva-brāhmaṇasampanno' devabrāhmaṇapūjanaparaḥ /

Vaśiṣṭhaḥ (17/2-4) :—

Anantāḥ putriṇo lokā nāputrasya loko'stīti śrūyate, aprajāḥ[18] santvadanāḥ / 'Prajābhiragre' mṛtatvam asyām ityapi nigamo bhavati /

'aprajāḥ santvadanāḥ' adanāḥ adanaśilāḥ rākṣasāḥ[19] ityarthaḥ / tenāputrasya nindā kṛtā putravataś ca stutiḥ / ityādīni cānyāni putrātideśe Vivādaratnākare evāsmābhir varṇitānīti / tāni tatraivānusandheyāni /

Iti Gṛhastharatnākare ṛṇāpakaraṇataraṅgaḥ /

Atha rakṣoghnācāraḥ /

Tatra Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇe (50/42-43, 45-47) Duḥsaha uvāca :—

Kṣutkṣāmo'smi jagannātha pipāsuś cāsmi durbalaḥ /
Kaścāśrayo[20] mamākhyāhi vaseyaṃ yatra nirvṛtaḥ //

Brahmovāca :—

Tavāśrayo gṛhaṃ puṃsāṃ janaś cādhārmiko balam /
Puṣṭir nityakriyāhānya tava vatsa bhaviṣyati //
Ucchiṣṭāpakvaṃ asvinnam avalīḍham asaṃskṛtam[21] /
[22]Bhagnabhāṇḍagataṃ tadvan mukhavātopaśāmitam //
[23]Bhagnāsanagato bhuṅkte[24] āsannāgata eva ca /
Vidinmukhaṃ sandhyayośca nṛtyavādyasvarottamam[25] //
[26]Udakyā paśyatā bhuktam udakyā hatam eva ca /
Yaccopaghātavat kiñcid bhakṣyaṃ bhojyam athāpivā //
[27]Etāni ... ...

Bibliography and Abbreviations

B.D.S.=Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtra

18. Corrected from V.D.S. The D.C. MS. reads 'aputrāḥ.'
19. Corrected from V.R. The D.C. MS. reads 'aprajāḥ satvatriṇaḥ atriḥ pālana-sīlāḥ bāndhavā 'ityarthaḥ.'
20. Corrected from the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa. The D.C. MS. reads 'kathaṃśre-yo.'
21. Corrected from the same. The D.C. MS. reads 'Ucchāṣmāpaṇaprabhṛtibalākha-tvādisthitam.'
22. Corrected from the same. The D.C. MS. reads 'bhinna°.'
23. Corrected from the same. The D.C. Ms. reads 'bhinnā°'.
24. Corrected from the same. The D.C. MS. reads 'asandī°',
25. Corrected from the same. The D.C. MS. reads '°mivākule'.
26. Corrected from the same. The D.C.MS. reads 'udakyāṃ'.
27. Corrected from the same. The D.C. MS. reads 'dattāni'. (Verse 48 of chap. 50 of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa begins from here)

D.C.M.S.=(Poona) Deccan College MS. (No. 44 of A 1883-84)
V.D.S.=Vaśiṣṭha-dharma-śāstra, ed. by Fuhrer, B.O.R.I. Poona, 1930
V.R.=Vivāda-ratnākra, ed. by MM. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛti-tirtha, *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1931
Āpastamba-dharma-sūtra, edited by Chinnaswami Shastri, Benares, 1932 (*Kashi Sanskrit Series*, No. 93)
Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtra—(1) edited by the same, Benares, 1934. (2) edited by L. Srinivasa-carya, Mysore, 1901 (*Bibliotheca Sanskrita*, No. 34)
Gautama-dharma-sūtra—edited by the same, Mysore, 1917, (*Bibliotheca Samskrit*, No. 50)
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa—edited by Rev. K.M. Banerji, *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1862.
Viṣṇu-smṛti, edited by Julius Jolly, *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1881.

Appendix (E)

(a) The Gaṅgāvākyāvalī (G.V.) quotations in the works of Govindānanda

(i) V.K.K. G.V.

1. p. 97=p. 176 : Yacca 'janmasapāṣṭa...darśanam' iti Gaṅgāvākyāvalīkāreṇa...vacanaṃ likhitaṃ... /
2. p. 107=p. 178 : Gaṅgāvākyāvalīkārastu...'sūtake...vivarjayet'...nānyad ityāha /

(ii) Ś.K. G.V.

3. p. 217=p. 176 : the same as that on p. 97 of V.K.K. with the simple change of 'saptāṣṭajanma' for 'janmasaptāṣṭa'

(b) Kṛtyaratnākara quotation in Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī (D. bh.)

D. bh. K.R.

p. 19=p. 362 : Kṛtyaratnākare...'Kanyāyāṃ...mahat' / Vide 'Raghunandana's indebtedness to his predecessors. pp. 199-201 for the quotations from the works of Vidyāpati, including the Gaṅgāvākyāvalī and Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī, in the works of Raghunandana.

Appendix (F)

The Pitṛbhakti (P.B.) quotations in Śr. K. K of Govindānanda.

Śr. K.K. P.B.

1. p. 85=folio 3b : Ata eva Śrīdattalikhito' *dya*prayogo' pinirastaḥ /
2. p. 137=folio 25a : Śrīdattādayastu 'saṃsravaṇādi c'eti paṭhitvā ādipadenārghapātrāvaśiṣṭānāṃ tila-puṣpa-pavitrāṇāṃ grahaṇam iti vyākhyāya pavitrāṇi pitṛpātre sthāpayitvā nyubjaṃ kāryam ityāhuḥ' / tanmandam /

3. p. 138=folio 25b :	Mahâbhârate 'uttara'śabdasya vāmārthatvadarśanāt. Brâhmaṇânāṃ vāmapārśva iti Halâyudha-Śrīdatta-Śrâddhapradīpakârâḥ /
4. p. 179=folio 15a :	Yacca Śrīdattamatânusāriṇā prācīnâcâradūṣaṇa-grahilena Pâraskara-sūtra-tulyam agnidagdhaścetyanantaraṃ punar madhu vātā madhviti ca trir japtvā Gobhilasūtraṃ dharma-lopâya loka-viruddham ādhunikena kalpitaṃ tat sarva-deśīya-Gobhila-pustakeṣvadṛṣṭatvât Bhaṭṭabhāṣyâdīnâm asammatatvâccopahasanīyam eva /
5. p. 185=folio 15b :	Atra kapiñjalâdhikaraṇanyāyena 'kuśāṃstrīṃ strīṇ'iti Śrīdattaḥ / tan mandam /
6. p. 310=folio 33a :	'Pitrâditrayapatnīst'viti Śrīdattakṛtaḥ pāṭhaḥ /
7. p. 474=folios 36b & 37a :	Atra Pârijâta-Ratnâkara-Śrīdattādayaḥ 'tasyoktaḥ pârvaṇo vidhir' iti tasyetyekavacanâd yasya mṛtāhas tasyai-va pârvaṇa-vidhānâtideśāt pitāmaha-prapitāmahaśrâddhasya ca pradhānasyânatideśâd aikapuruṣikam eva pārvaṇam iti vadanti / tan mandam /

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

(A) Sanskrit works

H. L. = Hāralatā of Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa
K. R. = Kṛtyaratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara Ṭhakkura
Gṛ. R. = Gṛhastharatnākara „ „
V. R. = Vivādaratnākara „ „
T. C. = Tīrthacintāmaṇi of Vācaspati Miśra
V.K.K.= Varṣakriyākaumudī of Gobindānanda
D.K.K.= Dānakriyākaumudī „
Śr.K.K.= Śrāddhakriyākaumudī „
Śuddhikaumudī „
Edited by—MM. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha in the *Bibliotheca Indica* between 1902-1931

Agastyasaṃhitā—edited by the same in the Bengali script with a Bengali translation and published by the *Hitavādī* office, calcutta, 1910.

Rājanītiratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara Ṭhakkura—edited by Dr. K. P. Jayaswal, Patna, 1924.

D. K. = Dānakāṇḍa of the Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara Bhaṭṭa
T. K. = Tīrthakāṇḍa „ „
Śrāddhakāṇḍa „ „
edited by Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 1941, 1942 and 1950.

D. S. = Dānasāgara of Ballāla Sena, edited by the present writer in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (work no. 274), 1953-6; partly edited with a Bengali translation up to *pañcalāṅgalakamahādāna* (p. 151 of the printed edition) by Śyāmācarana Kaviratna, Calcutta, 1914-1919 ;
partly edited in the Bengali script with a Bengali translation up to *dānāpavāda* (p. 44 of the printed edition), Calcutta. Its title-page is missing in the copy consulted.

G. V. = Gaṅgāvākyāvalī of Vidyāpati, edited by Dr. J. B. Chowdhuri, Calcutta, 1940, in his 'The contribution of women to Sanskrit Literature.' vols. iii and iv.

D. bh.= Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī of the same author, Darbhanga, 1900-1901.
Śaivasarvasvasāra of the same author, Darbhanga, 1897.
Śrāddhaviveka of Śūlapāṇi, edited in the Bengali script with the commentary of Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra by MM. Caṇḍicaraṇa Smṛtibhūṣaṇa, Calcutta, 1907.

T. T. = Tithitattva of Raghunandana, edited by the same in the Bengali script with the commentary of Kāśīrāma Vācaspati, Calcutta.

The same work of Raghunandana
Malamāsatattva ,,
Udvāhatattva ,,
Śuddhitattva ,,
K. T. = Kṛtyatattva ,,
E. T. = Ekādaśītattva ,,
M. P. T. = Maṭhapratiṣṭhāditattva ,,
Edited by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara in Smṛtitattva, vols. i & ii, Calcutta, 1895.

Rāmāyaṇa (in its three recessions, viz. Bengal, North-Western and Southern, and published from Paris, Lahore and Bombay, edited by G. Gorresio, D.A.V. College and Gujarati Printing Press)

M. bh. = Mahābhārata, Bombay oblong edition

Manusmṛti, published with the commentary of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa in the Bengali script, Vasumatī Sāhitya Mandira, Calcutta, 1929.

Yājñavalkyasmṛti, Ānandāśrama Press, Poona, 1903-4. The same with the Mitākṣarā of Vijñāneśvara, Burdwan.

Yogi-yājñavalkyasmṛti, edited by Swāmi Kuvalayānanda and Pandit Raghunāthaśāstrī Kokaje, Lonavla (Poona), 1951.

Dakṣasmṛti— edited by Bhavānīcaraṇa Banerji in the Bengali script in 'Atryādi-ūnaviṃśati-saṃhitāḥ', Calcutta.

Saṅkhasmṛti— ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,

Viṣṇudharmottara (-purāṇa), published by the Venkateṣvara Press, Bombay.

Sūryasiddhānta, edited with a Sanskrit commentary by MM. Sudhākara Dvivedī, *Bibliotheca Indica* (work no. 173), reprint of 1925.

Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭaji Dīkṣita, being a recast of Pāṇini, Sri Bālamanoramā Press, Madras, 1927.

(B) Sanskrit Mss.

Śuddhiratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara Ṭhakkura, Ms. No. 3826 of the Government of India Collections, under the care of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

The same work in another Ms., described in 'A Descriptive Catalogue of (Sanskrit) Mss. in Mithilā', vol. i, p. 436, by Drs. K. P. Jayaswal and A. Banerji-Shastri, published by the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna, 1927.

D. R. = Dānaratnākara of the same author, Deccan College Ms. No. 114 of 1884-86, under the care of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Gṛ. R. = Gṛhastharatnākara of the same author, Deccan College Ms. No. 44 of A 1883-84.

S. P. = Samayapradīpa of Śrīdatta Upādhyāya, Deccan College Ms. No. 371 of 1875-76

P. B. = Pitṛbhakti of the same author, Deccan College Ms. No. 152 of 1892-95.

Dānavākyāvalī of Vidyāpati, Deccan College Ms. No. 368 of 1891-95.

(C) Descriptive Catalogues of Sanskrit Mss.

Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Mss. of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. iii

(Smṛti), by MM. Haraprasad Shastri, published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1925.

A Descriptive Catalogue of (Sanskrit) Mss in Mithilâ, vol. i (see above for its other details).

(D) English works

H.D.=History of Dharmaśâstra, vols. i, ii, iii and v (Part I) by MM. Dr. P.V. Kane, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1930-1958.

Food and drink in Ancient Bengal by Taponath Chakravorty, Calcutta, 1959.

(E) Bengali works

Smṛtiśâstre Bāṅgālī, by Dr. S. C. Banerji, Calcutta, 1961/62.

Samâja-saṃskārka Raghunandana, by Dr. Vāṇi Chakravarti, Calcutta, 1964.

(F) Marathi work

Dharmaśâstravicâra, by MM. Dr. P. V. Kane, published by Mauj Printing Bureau, Bombay, 1935.

(G) Sanskrit English Dictionary and Oriental Journals in English

Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Principal V. S. Apte, vols. i-iii, Revised Edition, Prasad Prakashan, Poona, 1957-59

J.A.S.B.=Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. xi (1915)

Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, vols. xvi, 1927.

Journal of Oriental Research, vol. xviii, part ii, Madras, 1951,

Modern Review, Calcutta, November, 1932.

N.B.–The Bibliography and Abbreviations on pp. 107-8 have been omitted from the above list.

ERRATA

(Obvious typographical errors not included]

Read	For	Page and line
Kalpadrumo	*Kalpadruma*	6 (line 7)
settling	setting	7 (,, 22)
Recht	*Receht*	9 (line 4)
extant works	extants	11 (line 1)
unwieldy	unwildly	15 (last but one line of the text)
derive	drive	19 (line 4 from bottom)
dharmaśabdo	dharmośobedo	21 (note 33)
others' sacrifices	others sacrifices	22 (para 3, line 3)
Vaśiṣṭha	aśiṣṭha	25 (line 1)
ye dharmā	between 'vindhyāt' and 'ye'	25 (note 49)
conditions	condition	26 (line 8)
J. A. S. B.	J. S. B.	37 (note 70)
not of Vidyāpati	not Vidyāpati	39 (line 17)
and not to	and to	40 (last line of para 2)
another name of	another name	,, (line 21)
rūpanārāyaṇa i	*rūpanarāyaṇai*	,, (note 82)
have	has	43 (line 18)
udagayana	udayana	67 (last but one line of the text)
the latter	V. K. K.	70 (last line of note 119)
earth	wealth	72 (line 26)